LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
1800

Alicia Lambach — 1811.

A DISSERTATION

ON THE

Prophecy

CONTAINED IN

DANIEL IX. 24—27;

GENERALLY DENOMINATED

THE PROPHECY OF THE SEVENTY WEEKS.

BY THE

REV. GEORGE STANLEY FABER, B. D.

RECTOR OF REDMARSHALL.

"Daniel's prophecies reach to the end of the world; and there is scarce "a prophecy in the Old Testament concerning Christ, which doth not in "something or other relate to his second coming." Sir Isaac Newton's Observ. on Daniel, part i. chap. 10. p. 132.

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR F. C. AND J. RIVINGTON,

NO. 62, ST. PAUL'S CHURCH-YARD.

1811.

BS1556
.F32

Law and Gilbert, Printers, St. John's Square, London.

TO THE ANCIENT PEOPLE OF GOD,

THE DISPERSION OF THE HOUSE OF JUDAH,

A NATION FROM AGE TO AGE EXPECTING THE PROMISED MESSIAH,

THIS DISSERTATION

ON

A REMARKABLE PROPHECY,

WHICH NOT ONLY FORETELLS HIS ADVENT,

BUT WITH

NUMERICAL PRECISION DETERMINES EVEN THE PRECISE EPOCH

OF IT,

IS INSCRIBED AND DEDICATED

BY THEIR

SINCERE FRIEND AND WELL WISHER,

THE AUTHOR.

PREFACE.

THERE are few predictions that have been more repeatedly discussed than that which usually bears the name of *the prophecy of the seventy weeks*. Its acknowledged importance has excited universal attention: yet the very number of its discordant expositors seems to show, that no interpretation has hitherto been produced which is in *all* points unobjectionable. Such is certainly the impression left upon my own mind by the perusal of various commentaries on the prophecy in question. Most of them contain *something* good: but it has never yet been my fate to meet with any one, which is *altogether* satisfactory. This appeared to me to be a matter worthy of very serious consideration. For, if a *Christian* felt and acknowledged the difficulty of making this prophecy quadrate exactly with the times of him whom he receives as the Messiah; he could

could not but be conscious, that every intelligent *Jew* must *equally* feel the difficulty, which to *him* would doubtless be a matter of triumph. The advocate for the divine mission of Jesus might perhaps perplex his Hebrew opponent by urging, that the desolation of Jerusalem is represented in the prophecy as *succeeding* the times of the Messiah, that Jerusalem has *long* been desolate, and therefore that the times of the Messiah must be *past:* but possibly he might himself be little less perplexed, if his antagonist demanded an *unobjectionable* explanation of the prophecy as applied to Jesus; and if he urged, that, were Jesus *really* the Messiah, such an explanation surely *might* be produced and certainly *ought* to be expected. The matter, worthy as it is of consideration in *all* ages, further appeared to me to require a *peculiar* degree of attention in times like the *present*. Whatever be the precise date of the 1260 years, we cannot be *very* far removed from their termination; and, whenever their termination shall arrive, we may expect to see the restoration of the Jews commence. Such being the case, it is surely a point of no small importance,

importance, that one of the most remarkable prophecies relative to the Messiah should be clearly shewn to have been accomplished in the person of Jesus of Nazareth, or at least that all that part of it which *relates* to the Messiah should be shewn to have been thus accomplished. If this can be done, when the almost *mathematical* evidence of an accomplished *numerical* prophecy is considered, it may be hoped that at least *one* stumbling block in the way of the conversion of the Jews may be removed.

1. In order that the subject may be thoroughly discussed, it will be necessary *first* to inquire into *the proper mode of computing the seventy weeks.* This must plainly be ascertained, before any satisfactory attempt can be made at explanation.

2. The *second* point of inquiry will be *the true dates of the different edicts of the kings of Persia in favour of the Jews;* because from some one or other of these the seventy weeks must, by the express declaration of the prophecy, be reckoned.

3. It will in *the third place* be expedient to *examine the different interpretations which have hitherto*

therto been brought forward. The person, who prosecutes this examination, would do well to place himself in the situation of an unconverted Jew, to raise every objection against them that he is able, and to subject every position to the most rigid scrutiny. Thus will the ground be cleared for a more consistent interpretation, if any such can be produced.

4. After these preliminary discussions, it will be highly necessary to *examine the prophecy itself in the original language,* in order that, in *the fourth place,* we may ascertain its true meaning: for it is obvious, that, until we obtain what may be esteemed a faithful translation, every attempt at exposition must be altogether fruitless.

5. When this matter is settled, it will still be adviseable to postpone all direct applicatory interpretation, until we have, in *the fifth place,* considered *the mutual relation of the different clauses of the prophecy in the abstract.* For this purpose, we must endeavour, as far as may be, to divest ourselves of all predilection for particular modes of exposition: we must endeavour to forget, that the

prophecy has ever been at all explained: we must study it, as we would do any portion of uninspired writing, merely that we may learn the connection of its different clauses with each other, and thus elicit the general meaning of the author: we must sift it, in short, by the ordinary rules of composition; and thus exhibit, in a severe scientific form, its general abstract meaning, without any regard to what may or may not be its particular application to events. By adopting such a plan, we shall effectually curb the flights of imagination; bind down any future exposition to certain established rules; and deaden at least, if not altogether annihilate, the overbearing influence of prepossession.

6. We shall now be prepared, in *the sixth place*, to enter upon the main object of our inquiries, *an applicatory interpretation of the prophecy itself.* For this the mass of preliminary matter will be found peculiarly serviceable, not to say absolutely necessary. Our interpretation will be hedged in on every side. We shall be compelled to adhere to the mode of calculation, which has been shewn to be the true one. We shall be compelled to adhere

here to the chronology of the dates, which has been duly established. We shall be compelled to avoid all those errors, which have been detected and censured in other expositions. We shall be compelled to square our interpretation by the proposed version of the prophecy, so far as that version has been *proved* to exhibit the genuine sense of the original. And we shall be compelled to reject all expositions of particular parts of the prophecy, which will not quadrate with its abstract meaning as impartially ascertained according to the ordinary rules of composition. When we are thus confined on all sides, I will not indeed say, that the interpretation which we produce *must* be the true one; but I may certainly say, that there is at least a strong *probability* of its being so.

7. Yet, after every precaution, it is scarcely to be expected that our interpretation should be free from *all* objections: because objections doubtless may occur, which could not be guarded against in the preliminary matter however comprehensive. It will be proper therefore, in *the seventh place*, to *consider all those objections, which may be urged against*

against the system proposed, and which either have not been quite fully anticipated or have hitherto been altogether unnoticed.

8. When this has been done, the author may be allowed, in *the last place*, to *conclude with a few appropriate observations.*

Whether I have succeeded in producing an exposition *perfectly* unobjectionable, the public must determine. I have at least *attempted* to do so, both by avoiding what I conceive to be the errors of my predecessors, and by binding myself down to certain rules, from which I am not conscious that I have ever departed. Should it prove in any respect useful to the Jewish nation, the wish nearest the author's heart will be fulfilled.

June 28, 1809.

CONTENTS.

CONTENTS.

CHAP. I.

Concerning the proper mode of computing the seventy weeks.

IT is a question, whether the seventy weeks are composed of solar years or of lunar years; and, if of the latter, whether each year contains 354 days or 360 days. p. 3.

I. There is no reason to suppose, that the seventy weeks are composed of years containing each 354 days. p. 5.

II. But several arguments have been adduced to prove, that they are composed of years containing each 360 days. p. 7.

1. The grounds on which Mr. Marshall maintains this to have been the case. p. 7.

(1.) From the length of the Noctic year. p. 7.

(2.) From the length of the Egyptian year. p. 7.

(3.) From the length of the Greek year. p. 7.

(4.) From the length of the Roman year. p. 8.

(5.) From the length of the Chaldean and Persian year. p. 8.

(6.) From the length of the year of other Asiatic nations. p. 8.

(7.) From the three times and a half of Daniel and St. John. p. 8.

2. Granting the truth of this statement, it does not follow that the inference drawn from it is just; because, whatever might be the length of a *single* year, the question is, whether a *series* of such years was not by intercalation or other means made equal to a corresponding series of solar years. p. 8.

(1.) One

(1.) One method of lengthening the year of 360 days was by adding 5 supernumerary days at the end of it. p. 9.

(2.) Another method was by occasional monthly intercalation. p. 10.

3. Aware of this remark, Mr. Marshall attempts to shew that the year of 360 days was used *collectively* as well as *singly*. p. 11.

(1.) His first argument from the conversation of Solon with Cresus stated, and answered. p. 11.

(2.) His second argument from the continuance of the Babylonian captivity stated, and answered by shewing the true length of that captivity. p. 13.

(3.) His third argument from the collective sum of three years and a half stated, and answered. p. 34.

(4.) His fourth argument from Solomon's purveyorships stated, and answered. p. 36.

4. From the silence of Scripture there is reason to suppose, that monthly intercalations were unknown to the more ancient Jews: whence it will follow, that a series of their years must have been equal to a corresponding series of years either of 360 days each or of 365 days each. p. 38.

(1.) The latter argued to be the case from two of the great Jewish festivals being fixed to spring and autumn. p. 40.

(2.) From the lengths of the Levitical weeks of years. p. 42.

(3.) From the duration of the sojourning of the children of Israel. p. 43.

(4.) From the impossibility of reconciling the chronology of Israel with that of the neighbouring nations by the former mode of computation. p. 46.

5. The sum of the matter is, that the more ancient Jewish year must have been solar. p. 47.

6. This

6. This however is of no consequence in reckoning the seventy weeks; because, whatever might be the length of a *single* Jewish year, the fixed nature of the great festivals proves, that a *series* of such years must have been made equal to a corresponding series of solar years. p. 47.

III. The argument strengthened by the authority of persons who have written on the subject. p. 48.

1. Jackson. p. 49.
2. Prideaux. p. 60.
3. Sir Isaac Newton. p. 62.
4. Blayney. p. 62.
5. Davies. p. 65.

IV. The conclusion is, that the more ancient Jews used the solar year, and that they did not begin to use the intercalated lunar year until the time of the Greek princes in Asia, when the Rabbinical *Ve-Adar*, which is unknown in Scripture, was introduced. p. 74.

1. But, however this may be, the observance of the great festivals proves, that a series of Jewish years must have been equal to a series of solar years. p. 75.
2. Whence it will follow, that the 490 years of the seventy weeks must, either singly or collectively, be equal to 490 solar years. p. 76.
3. Therefore no interpretation of the prophecy can be admitted, which is built on a calculation by abbreviated lunar years of either description. p. 77.

CHAP. II.

Concerning the chronology of the decrees enacted by the Kings of Persia for the rebuilding of the temple and city of Jerusalem and for the restoration of the civil and ecclesiastical polity of Judah.

I. IT has generally been said that *four* decrees were enacted for these several purposes, but it does not appear that there were any more than *three*. p. 78.

II. The

II. The date of the first decree, enacted in the first year of Cyrus, is A. P. J. 4178 and A. A. C. 536. p. 82.

III. It has been questioned, whether the second decree was enacted by Darius Hystaspis or Darius Nothus. The latter opinion may be proved to be erroneous by four arguments. p. 83.

1. The first argument. p. 83.
2. The second argument. p. 84.
3. The third argument. p. 87.
4. The fourth argument. The second decree therefore was enacted in the third year of Darius Hystaspis, A. P. J. 4195 and A. A. C. 519. p. 91.

IV. There is a dispute respecting the true commencement of the reign of Artaxerxes Longimanus. p. 94.

1. The opinion of Petavius considered. p. 97.
2. The opinion of Usher considered. p. 101.
3. The opinion of Ptolemy and Prideaux adopted: whence the edict of the seventh year of Artaxerxes is fixed to A. P. J. 4256 and A. A. C. 458. p. 106.

V. A table shewing the dates of the three edicts and the verbal permission of the twentieth year of Artaxerxes, according to the years of the era of Nabonassar, the years of the Julian period, and the years before the Christian era. p. 106.

VI. The result from the preceding discussion is, that no interpretation of the prophecy can be admitted, unless it computes the seventy weeks from some one of the established dates of the Persian edicts. p. 107.

CHAP. III.

Concerning the various interpretations which have been given of the prophecy of the seventy weeks.

I. Interpretations, which reckon the period of the seventy weeks from the twentieth year of Artaxerxes Longimanus. p. 109.

I. Inter-

1. Interpretation of Africanus. Objections to it. p. 109.
2. Interpretations of Petavius and Usher. Objections to them. p. 112.
3. Interpretations of Lloyd, Marshall, Butt, and Wintle. p. 118.
(1.) First objection. p. 120.
(2.) Second objection. p. 120.
(3.) Third objection. p. 123.
(4.) Fourth objection. p. 128.
II. Interpretations, which reckon the period from the third or the sixth year of Darius, erroneously supposed to be Darius Nothus. Those of Scaliger and Mede. Objections to them. p. 136.
III. Interpretations, which reckon the period from the seventh year of Artaxerxes Longimanus. p. 137.
1. Interpretation of Sir Isaac Newton. Objections to it. p. 138.
2. Interpretation of Prideaux. Objections to it. p. 144.
3. Interpretation of Cornelius a Lapide. Objections to it. p. 157.
IV. Interpretations, which reckon the period from the first year of Cyrus. p. 158.
1. Interpretation of Blayney. p. 158.
(1.) Objections to the proposed new readings. p. 168.
(2.) Objections to the interpretation founded on them. p. 177.
2. Interpretation of Lancaster. p. 202.
(1.) First objection. p. 208.
(2.) Second objection. p. 211.
(3.) Third objection. p. 218.
(4.) Fourth objection. p. 221.
(5.) Fifth objection. p. 224.

CHAP. IV.

Concerning the proper translation of the prophecy.

THE supposed genuine original text exhibited and translated. p. 228.

I. A defence of four various readings. p. 230.
1. The first reading. p. 230.
2. The second reading. p. 230.
3. The third reading. p. 230.
4. The fourth reading. p. 231.

II. A defence of certain variations from the common English version. p. 232.
1. The first variation. p. 232.
2. The second variation. p. 233.
3. The third variation. p. 234.
4. The fourth variation. p. 235.
5. The fifth variation. p. 235.
6. The sixth variation. p. 235.
7. The seventh variation. p. 237.
8. The eighth variation. p. 238.
9. The ninth variation. p. 242.
10. The tenth variation. p. 242.
11. The eleventh variation. p. 245.
12. The twelfth variation. p. 245.
13. The thirteenth variation. p. 253.
14. The fourteenth variation. p. 254.
15. The fifteenth variation. p. 254.

CHAP. V.

Concerning the mutual relation of the different clauses of the prophecy considered in the abstract.

THE importance and utility of establishing certain abstract positions, deduced from an examination of the prophecy itself without reference to any system of interpretation. p. 256.

1. The

1. The first abstract position. p. 258.
2. The second. p. 259.
3. The third. p. 260.
4. The fourth. p. 260.
5. The fifth. p. 262.
6. The sixth. p. 262.
7. The seventh. p. 265.
8. The eighth. p. 265.
9. The ninth. p. 268.
10. The tenth. p. 268.
11. The eleventh. p. 271.
12. The twelfth. p. 274.

CHAP. VI.

An inquiry into the proper interpretation of the prophecy.

I. A DISCUSSION of the first clause of the prophecy, contained in Ver. 24. p. 281.

1. An inquiry into the import of the six particulars contained in this clause. p. 281.
(1.) The first particular. p. 282.
(2.) The second particular. p. 286.
(3.) The third particular. p. 290.
(4.) The fourth particular. p. 292.
(5.) The fifth particular. p. 293.
(6.) The sixth particular. p. 297.

2. With three of these particulars, which are synchronical and chronologically later than the other three particulars, the seventy weeks must terminate: and, since these three later particulars synchronize with the crucifixion, the seventy weeks must terminate with the crucifixion. Therefore they must commence seventy weeks or 490 years before the crucifixion. And this epoch of their commencement precisely coincides

with the date of the going forth of the decree in the seventh year of Artaxerxes Longimanus. Therefore that decree must be the decree mentioned in the prophecy. p. 299.

3. The question discussed, how this arrangement agrees with the seventy weeks being the times of the holy city. p. 302.

(1.) In order to reconcile them, we are necessarily led to conclude, that the holy city is not the literal Jerusalem, but a figurative holy city, namely the Levitical church and polity. p. 302.

(2.) This point is established by comparing the prophecy with the edict of the seventh year of Artaxerxes. p. 303.

(3.) It is likewise established by the context of the prophecy itself. p. 310.

(4.) Such an interpretation accords with the acknowledged exposition of other parallel passages. p. 312.

II. A discussion of the second clause, contained in Ver. 25. p. 315.

1. Arrangement of the smaller periods comprehended within the seventy weeks. p. 316.

(1.) The sixty nine weeks reach *unto the Messiah*, by which must be understood *unto the commencement of the Gospel dispensation*. Accordingly, if reckoned from the seventh year of Artaxerxes Longimanus, they terminate in A. P. J. 4739; which is the fifteenth year of Tiberius calculated from his admission to a copartnership of the empire, and in which the ministry of John the Baptist (declared by our Lord to be the beginning of the Gospel dispensation) commenced. p. 316.

(2.) A reply to Mr. Marshall's objections against this arrangement of St. Luke's fifteenth year of Tiberius. p. 321.

2. The

2. The seven weeks reach to the completion of the rebuilding of the figurative holy city, which must have taken place about A. P. J. 4305. p. 327.

(1.) The first objection against this arrangement answered. p. 332.

(2.) The second objection answered. p. 333.

(3.) The third objection answered. p. 336.

3. In what manner the rebuilding of the holy city was to be carried on *with perpetual increase and firm decision.* p. 339.

III. A discussion of the third clause, contained in the former part of Ver. 26. Messiah's divorce of the Levitical church after the expiration of the sixty nine weeks, p. 340.

IV. A discussion of the fourth clause, contained in the latter part of Ver. 26. p. 348.

1. The corruption of the people was the cause of Messiah's divorcing the Levitical church. p. 348.

2. The punishment of the people for their corruption. p. 353.

3. In what manner there were *desolations to the end of the war.* 353.

(1.) The miseries experienced by Jerusalem. p. 353.

(2.) The miseries experienced by Judèa. p. 357.

4. How the war was *firmly decided upon.* p. 360.

V. A discussion of the fifth clause, contained in the former part of Ver. 27. The making of the new covenant during one week, and the disannulling of the old one. p. 364.

VI. A discussion of the sixth clause, contained in the latter part of Ver. 27. p. 373.

1. The abolition of the daily sacrifice in half a week. p. 373.

(1.) Dr. Prideaux's great error is the supposing this half week to be the half of the seventieth week. p. 373.

(2.) It

(2.) It is the three years and a half that elasped before the abolition of the Levitical sacrifices towards the close of the siege of Jerusalem. p. 376.

2. The Messiah caused them to cease by the instrumentality of the Roman arms. p. 379.

3. Yet it is foretold in this last clause of the prophecy, that the Romans themselves are in their turn destined to destruction, and that the Jewish sacrifices shall be restored in a spiritual manner, at the expiration of the great period of 1260 years. p. 379.

(1.) This interpretation is necessary for various reasons. It alone reconciles Daniel with Jeremiah. It exhibits Daniel in unison both with himself and with all the other prophets. It appears to be the very interpretation given by our Lord himself. It removes certain objections built on the connection of the prophecy with Daniel's previous supplication. p. 383.

(2.) Objection to it answered. p. 392.

4. How the end poured upon the desolator is *firmly decided upon*. p. 394.

VII. An explanatory paraphrase of the whole prophecy. p. 395.

1. Paraphrase of the first clause. p. 395.
2. Paraphrase of the second clause. p. 396.
3. Paraphrase of the third clause. p. 397.
4. Paraphrase of the fourth clause. p. 398.
5. Paraphrase of the fifth clause. p. 398.
6. Paraphrase of the sixth clause. p. 398.

CHAP. VII.

An examination of the objections which may be made to the preceding interpretation.

I. THE first objection to *the mystic interpretation of Jerusalem*. p. 400.

1. The first answer to it. p. 401.
2. The second answer to it. p. 402.
(1.) The first corollary to the second answer. p. 403.
(2.) The second corollary. p. 404.

II. The second objection to *the divorce taking place before the times of the holy city had fully expired.* The reply to it. p. 406.

III. The third objection to *the deficiency of proof that the rebuilding of the figurative holy city was completed at the end of the seven weeks.* The reply to it. p. 408.

IV. The fourth objection to *the referring the last week of the seventy to the period of the ministration of the Gospel, on the ground of its being interposed in the midst of matters relative to the Jewish war.* The reply to it. p. 413.

V. The fifth objection to *the half week being considered as no part of the seventieth week.* The reply to it. p. 416.

VI. The sixth objection to *the computation of the seventy weeks by solar years.* The reply to it. p. 419.

CHAP. VIII.

Observations by way of conclusion.

1. An accomplished prophecy is not necessarily so clear as to be understood without labour or mental exertion. p. 422.
2. An addres to the Jews. p. 424.
3. An address to Christians. p. 427.

APPENDIX.

APPENDIX.

No. I.

The astronomical canon of Ptolemy arranged synchronically with the kings of Judah and Assyria, the high-priests of Judah, the Greek kings of Syria, and the princes and kings of Judèa. p. 430.

No. II.

Succession of the kings of Judah, the high-priests of Judah and the princes and kings of Judèa, from the commencement of the era of Nabonassar, arranged synchronically with the kings of Babylon, Assyria, Persia, Egypt, Syria, and the Roman emperors. p. 433.

A

DISSERTATION

ON THE

PROPHECY

OF THE

SEVENTY WEEKS.

A

DISSERTATION, &c.

CHAPTER I.

Concerning the proper mode of computing the seventy weeks.

IN an attempt to elucidate *the prophecy of the seventy weeks*, as the prediction contained in the latter end of the ninth chapter of Daniel is usually denominated, the first point necessary to be ascertained is *the proper mode of computing those weeks*.

That they are weeks, of which *each day* is to be estimated as *a year*, is almost universally allowed*: but

* Mr. Wintle mentions an anonymous writer on this prophecy, who has confined the weeks altogether to weeks of days (Trans. of Dan. in loc.): and some of the Jewish Rabbies, to evade the

but there has been a considerable discrepance of opinion respecting the *kind* of year which may be supposed to have been used by Daniel—Several commentators have maintained, that the prophet reckons by solar years; or, what amounts to the same thing, that the 490 years of *the seventy weeks* are, according to the Jewish mode of computation, *collectively* equal to 490 solar years. Among these we find the names of Usher, Petavius, Scaliger, Mede, Prideaux, Sir Isaac Newton, Cornelius a Lapide, Lancaster, and Blayney—Others have maintained, that he reckons by lunar years *collectively*, no less than *singularly:* which makes the 490 years fall considerably short of 490 solar years. This opinion was first advanced by Africanus, who flourished in the beginning of the third century: and he has been followed by Theodoret, Bede, Zonaras, Rupertus, and most of the Romish expositors—But those, who agree in adopting the computation by lunar years, differ

argument which Christians draw from it in favour of the Messiahship of Jesus, pretend, that each week is a jubilee or 49 years, and consequently that the whole *seventy weeks* are equivalent to 3430 years (Cornel. a Lap. Comment. in Dan. ix. 24.). But such systems as these have ever been short-lived. As for the Talmud, it acknowledges *the seventy weeks* to be 490 years (Ibid.). The same opinion is likewise maintained by Menasseh Ben Israel, R. Isaac Abarbanel, R. Jos. Jacchias, R. Aben Ezra, and others. Marshall on the seventy weeks. Introduct. p. 10.

among

among themselves respecting the *length* of the lunar year which they suppose Daniel to have used. Africanus and his immediate followers contend, that we ought to reckon by the true astronomical lunar year of about 354 days: Bp. Lloyd, Mr. Marshall, Mr. Wintle, and Mr. Butt, prefer the false lunar year of 360 days.

I. I know not, that any argument has been adduced in favour of the *first* mode of lunar computation, except one, which is in fact a *general* argument, tending to prove that the prophet does not use natural solar years, but abbreviated lunar years of *some* description. It is built upon an expression in the exordium of the prediction. What is rendered in our common English translation *Seventy weeks are determined*, is rendered in the Vulgate *Seventy weeks are abbreviated*, and in the Greek version of Theodotion *Seventy weeks have been cut short* *. Hence it has been inferred, that a method of *shorter* reckoning is to be adopted, and that a continued series of lunar years is that employed by Daniel.

It is manifest, that this argument rests wholly on *a translation:* and the translation is such, that its propriety may very well be questioned. The word

* Ἑβδομήκοντα ἑβδομάδες συνετμήθησαν. The Greek version of Daniel, which generally bears the name of the LXX, appears in reality to have been the work of Theodotion.

חתך does not occur elsewhere in the whole Bible, either in its primitive form or in that of one of its derivatives: but in the writings of the Rabbies it is frequently to be met with. The signification, which they ascribe to it, is that of *cutting*: nor is there any reason to pronounce them mistaken in supposing that such is the primary import of the word. The question therefore is, in what *sense* of *cutting* we are to understand it in the passage now under discussion: for it is obvious, that *to cut short* or *to abbreviate* is only one of the many complex ideas which spring alike from the original simple idea *to cut*. That we are no way *bound* to understand it in the sense of *abbreviating*, the sense required by the argument is manifest from the Chaldee Paraphrase on Esther *, in which the word itself occurs. A man is there said to be called חתך, because by him all the affairs of the kingdom מתחתכן, which the Latin interpreter renders *were decided* or *determined*. Here, though the sense of *cutting* is involved, because, when a matter is decided, it is *cut off* from other matters which have not yet been brought to a legal investigation, we have nothing that conveys the idea of *abbreviation*. It must therefore be mere unsupported conjecture to suppose, that in this word any hint is

* Chap. iv. 5.

given

given by the prophet that he is using years of a shorter compass than solar years.

II. In favour of the *second* mode of lunar computation, several arguments, which are sufficiently specious, have been urged by Mr. Marshall, who has adopted and strenuously defended the hypothesis of Bp. Lloyd: but they do not appear to me by any means to prove his point.

1. The following are the grounds, on which he maintains, that the false lunar year of 360 days was used both by the Jews and other ancient nations: whence he infers that *the seventy weeks* must be reckoned according to it.

(1.) In the time of Noah a month was 30 days, because five months are said to be equal to 150 days*; therefore the year consisted of 360 days.

(2.) Manetho tells us, that the ancient Egyptian year contained only 360 days, and that in the time of Aseth five days were added to it, which were therefore called *additional days*.

(3.) Among the Greeks, in the time of Cleobulus Lindius, who was contemporary with Daniel, the year was also the same length.

* Compare Gen. vii. 24. viii. 3. vii. 11. viii. 4. From the seventeenth day of the second month, to the seventeenth day of the seventh month, there were just five months; and this period is represented as being equal to 150 days.

(4.) Such

(4.) Such also was the length of the year among the Romans, during the reign of Romulus, as we are informed by Plutarch.

(5.) The same was its length among the Chaldèans and Persians, even after the taking of Babylon by the latter.

(6.) It obtained also among the other Asiatic nations, particularly the Lydians, who were the allies of the Chaldèans in their war against Cyrus.

(7.) Lastly, as a proof positive, that such is the length of the scriptural year, Mr. Marshall observes, that *the three times and a half* of Daniel and St. John are represented as being equal to 42 months, and those 42 months plainly contain 1260 days: but, since this is only so at the rate of 360 days to the year, it will follow that each year contains 360 days *.

2. Now, granting the truth of the whole of this *statement*, it does not by any means follow, that the *conclusion* drawn from it is a just one. In order to ascertain the length of *the seventy prophetic weeks*, we must not consider the precise length of *a solitary insulated year* among the Jews; but we must examine into the length of *a continued period of such years:* that is to say, we must not reckon, by an

* Marshall's Treatise on the Seventy Weeks. Part ii. chap. iv. p. 233—252.

arbitrary

arbitrary mechanical calculation of our own, that *a term of ancient years* contains exactly *such a number of ancient years*, be their *individual* lengths what they may; but we must inquire, whether *a term of ancient years* was not, by intercalations or other additions, made, in matter of fact, precisely equal to *a corresponding term of natural solar years*. Should this last prove to be the case, whatever might be the length of a *single* year of the 490 years, *the collective series* of those years will undoubtedly be equal to the same series of true astronomical solar years.

(1.) One of the expedients used to make the imperfect year of 360 days tally with the natural year was, as Mr. Marshall himself allows, *the addition of five supernumerary days at the end of it*. Such he confesses to have been the plan adopted by the Chaldèans, the Persians, and the Egyptians, even in the days of Daniel, not to say long before; and such indisputably was the plan that was followed in the construction of the Nabonassarean year. The probability therefore is, that the prophet used this year. But, if such were the plan adopted by those nations, no argument can be drawn from the length of each month to prove the length of the whole year. The five additional days were accounted a part of *no* month; and they were considered rather as *supplementary* to the year, than as *properly belonging* to it.

it. Hence the circumstance of five Noetic months at the time of the deluge being equal to 150 days will not prove, that the Noetic year *really* contained no more than 360 days, though it might *nominally* do so; because, whether the year consisted of 12 months of 30 days each *only*, or of 12 months of 30 days each, *and 5 additional days belonging to no month*, in either case 5 months would be equal to 150 days. Hence also the circumstance of three years and a half being represented as comprehending indifferently 42 months and 1260 days, will not prove that the *real* length of the year in the time of Daniel was only 360 days. The same result would come out, if the *reputed* length of the year, viewed as containing 12 months of 30 days each, were alone considered, and if the additional days were not taken into the account for the convenience of having three perfectly coincident numbers. And we may safely conclude, that this curtailed mode of reckoning by the *nominal* year *is* here followed; because, by the acknowledgment of Mr. Marshall himself, a year of 360 days *with 5 supernumerary days*, not a year of 360 days *simply*, was used by the very people among whom Daniel resided.

(2.) Another expedient used was that of *occasional intercalation*. Various were the methods of intercalating, and some of them grossly erroneous; but their

their object uniformly was to prevent the revolution of the months through all the seasons successively, and thus to make the gross amount of any given series of lunar years equal to that of a corresponding series of solar years.

According to either of these expedients, it is obvious, that, whatever might be the length of a *single* year either nominally or really, the *collective sum* of 490 years of any description would be equal to 490 solar years.

3. Of the cogency of this remark Mr. Marshall is perfectly aware; and therefore, in reply to it, he endeavours to shew that the lunar year of 360 days was used, not only *singularly*, but *collectively*.

(1.) His first argument is deduced from the conversation of Solon with Cresus, as recorded by Herodotus. Solon, to shew the great variety of circumstances which occur in the life time of a man who attains to the age of seventy years, computes the number of days in such a man's life; and then remarks, that the events of no one day are exactly the same as those of another. In making his calculation, he first estimates the years unintercalated; and tells us, that in seventy years there are 25,200 days. He then reckons a leap-month as being added every other year; and says, that the 35 leap-months contain 1050 days. Lastly he takes the sum of the 25,200 and the 1050 days, or 26,250

26,250 days, as being the true amount of seventy years. Now 25,200 days in seventy years are at the rate of 360 days in a year. Hence, because Solon in his calculation first reckons the number of days in seventy years of 360 days each without taking the leap-months into the account, Mr. Marshall argues, that the collective sum of seventy such years was *not* equal to seventy solar years.

The passage, whence he draws this conclusion, seems to me plainly to prove the very reverse. Solon, so far from teaching us that the collective sum of seventy years of 360 days each was *only* 25,200 days, tells us, that, when the intercalated months were taken into the account, it was 26,250 days. The gross error of this *mode* of intercalation it is superfluous to point out: but the *passage itself*, so far from proving that lunar years were used *without* intercalation, and that a series of them taken *collectively* fell considerably short of a corresponding series of solar years, decidedly proves, that they were *not* used without intercalation, and that the expedient of intercalation was adopted (however in the *present* instance it would soon be found insufficient) *for the express purpose* of making the seasons of the year fall out at their proper times*, and of thus

* Ἵνα ἀι ὧραι συμβαινωσι παραγινομεναι ες το δεον. Herod. lib. i. §. 32.

rendering

rendering any series of lunar years *collectively* equal to the same series of solar years.

(2.) His second argument is deduced from the continuance of the Babylonian captivity. This is declared in Scripture to be *seventy years*. Now 70 years of 360 days each are equal, within two days, to 69 solar years. Mr. Marshall therefore attempts to shew, that the Babylonian captivity lasted no longer than 69 solar years: and thence infers, that years of 360 days each were used *collectively* without intercalation. For this purpose he reckons, that Jerusalem was taken by Nebuchadnezzar in the November of the year A. C. 606, when the captivity of Judah commenced; that Babylon was taken by Cyrus towards the end of the year A. C. 539; and that Darius the Mede died towards the close of the year A. C. 537, when Cyrus attaining to undivided empire enacted his decree for the restoration of the Jews, and thus put an end to the captivity at the expiration of 69 solar years or 70 years of 360 days each after its commencement.

With respect to the dates on which this hypothesis is founded, I certainly believe with Mr. Marshall, that Jerusalem was taken by Nebuchadnezzar in the November of the year A. C. 606, as Dr. Prideaux supposes, not in the November of the year A. C. 607, as Abp. Usher supposes: but it may

nevertheless be shewn, from a comparison of the canon of Ptolemy with Scripture and Xenophon, that *more* than 67 solar years must have elapsed between that event and the capture of Babylon by Cyrus; whence it will follow, since Darius the Mede reigned 2 years after the capture of Babylon, that *more* than 69 solar years must have elapsed between the taking of Jerusalem and the commencement of the undivided reign of Cyrus.

Daniel informs us, that Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, came against Jerusalem to besiege it in the *third* year of Jehoiakim*: and Jeremiah delivered one of his prophecies of *the seventy years* immediately before the city was taken, in the *fourth* year of Jehoiakim, which he tells us was the *first* year of Nebuchadnezzar†. But it appears from Daniel, that Nebuchadnezzar was king of Babylon in Jehoiakim's *third* year also; because he says, that in *that very third* year, *then* being king, he came against Jerusalem to besiege it. It will follow therefore, that *the first year* of Nebuchadnezzar must have coincided with *the latter part of the third and the former part of the fourth year* of Jehoiakim‡. And, since Jerusalem was taken in *the*

* Dan. i. 1. † Jerem. xxv. 1.

‡ It seems to have commenced almost at the close of the third year of Jehoiakim: as Abp. Usher observes, "desinente "tertio,

the fourth year of Jehoiakim, it will likewise follow that it must have been taken in *the latter part of the first year* of Nebuchadnezzar—Daniel further informs us, that he and other captives were maintained and taught at the king's expence *three years* *. Such being the case, the first of these years must have coincided with the close of Nebuchadnezzar's first year and the greater part of his second year: the second, with the close of his second year and the greater part of his third year: and the third, with the close of his third year and the greater part of his fourth year. But Daniel tells us, that *after* these three years he was brought before Nebuchadnezzar to interpret his dream, and that this happened in the king's *second* year †. Hence it is evident, that the *fourth* year of Nebuchadnezzar, according to Jeremiah's reckoning, coinciding as it does with the greater part of the third of Daniel's three years of education, must coincide with the *second* year of Nebuchadnezzar, according to Daniel's reckoning. It will follow therefore, as chronologers justly calculate ‡, that Nebuchadnez-

" tertio, et ineunte quarto Jehojakimi anno, ex Dan. i. 1. " collato cum Jerem. xxv. 1. intelligimus." Annal. in A. P. J. 4107.

* Dan. i. 5. † Dan. ii. 1.

‡ On the authority, as Dr. Prideaux remarks, of Berosus apud Joseph. Ant. Jud. lib. x. c. 11. et contra Apion. lib. i.

zar

zar reigned two years in conjunction with his father Nabopollassar; and that Jeremiah computes from the beginning of his *joint* reign, while Daniel computes from the beginning of his *undivided* reign. Consequently, the two last years of Nabopollassar are the two first of Nebuchadnezzar, according to Jeremiah's reckoning: and Jerusalem, having been taken by Nebuchadnezzar in his *first* year according to that reckoning, must have been taken in the *penultimate* year of Nabopollassar. Now, according to the canon of Ptolemy, which gives the reign of each king from the *death* of his predecessor, Nabocolassar, the *Nebuchadnezzar* of Scripture, reigned 43 years; Elyarodamus, 2 years; Nericassolassar, 4 years; and Nabonadius, the *Belshazzar* of Scripture, 17 years: amounting, in the whole, to 66 years*. But Nebuchadnezzar reigned conjointly with his father 2 years; and, at the latter end of the first year of his copartnership in the empire, Jerusalem was taken by him. To the 66 years therefore we must add a year and a fraction of the 2 years of Nebuchadnezzar's joint reign; and we shall have 67 years and a fraction of uncertain length, at the end of which Babylon was taken and Belshazzar slain—After Nabonadius or Belshazzar Ptolemy places Cyrus, and ascribes to him 9 years: but

* See the canon of Ptolemy in the Appendix.

Scripture

Scripture places the reign of Darius the Mede in Babylon, between Belshazzar and Cyrus; and Xenophon ascribes to Cyrus only 7 years. Darius therefore, who is overlooked by Ptolemy, must have reigned jointly with Cyrus 2 years. Hence it will follow, that the scriptural *first year* of Cyrus must be the same as Xenophon's *first year* of Cyrus; and that this *first year* must coincide with his *third year* according to the canon of Ptolemy. Add the 2 years of Darius, or Ptolemy's 2 first years of Cyrus, to the 67 years and a fraction, and the product will be 69 years and a fraction—This space of time then must have elapsed between the capture of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar and the accession of Cyrus to undivided empire. Therefore, supposing Cyrus to have enacted his decree for the restoration of the Jews *immediately* upon the death of Darius and at the *very beginning* of his scriptural first year (*sooner* than this he could not have enacted it consistently with Ezra's account), there still would be *more* than 69 solar years or 70 years of 360 days each between the capture of Jerusalem and the enacting of the decree of Cyrus *.

What

* Dr. Prideaux, by a somewhat similar calculation, brings out a result of 69 solar years and two months, as being the period of time that elapsed between the capture of Jerusalem and the accession of Cyrus to sole empire. I suspect however, that

What has been said sufficiently invalidates Mr. Marshall's argument, which is founded on the opinion that *exactly* 69 solar years was the length of the Babylonian captivity. Yet, while I am persuaded that its duration was 70 solar years, I cannot altogether assent to the arrangement either of Usher or Prideaux. I fully agree with the latter of these authors, as I have already observed, that Jerusalem must have been taken by Nebuchadnezzar in the November of the year A. C. 606. This point may, I think, be sufficiently proved. That the city was taken on the eighteenth day of November or on the corresponding day of the ninth month *Cisleu*, appears from the annual fast in commemoration of it still kept by the Jews*: the only question therefore is, in the November of *what* year it was taken. Now it appeared from the preceding discussion, that it was taken in the penultimate year of Nabopollassar, according to the canon of Ptolemy: but this year coincides with the year A.C. 606: therefore the city must have been taken in the November of the year A.C. 606. And, that this is the true date of its capture, we may further collect from the sum of years ascribed by Ptolemy

he makes the fraction of a year too short. See his Connect. Part i. B. ii. p. 135.

* Usser. Annal. in A. P. J. 4107—Prideaux's Connect. Part i. B. i. p. 64.

to the Babylonian princes after Nabopollassar. This sum, as we have seen, is 66 years. Add to it the year and a fraction of the reign of Nabopollassar, which elapsed after the capture of Jerusalem, and we have 67 years and a fraction. And add to this last sum the 2 years of Darius, and we have 69 years and a fraction. Thus we learn, that 69 years and a fraction of indefinite length elapsed between the capture of Jerusalem and the accession of Cyrus to undivided empire. But the scriptural first year of Cyrus coincides with the year A. C. 536. Now, from whatever point in this year we suppose his sole reign to have commenced, if we reckon back from that point 69 years, we shall be brought to the corresponding point in the year A. C. 605: and, if from this point in the year A. C. 605 we reckon back the additional fraction of a year to the first November, we shall be brought to the November in the year A. C. 606. Or, if we suppose with Prideaux the sole reign of Cyrus to have commenced at the very close of the year A. C. 537, the result will still be the same: for, in that case, the 69 years reckoned backward will bring us to the very close of the year A. C. 606; and the additional fraction, to the November of the same year. Thus I think it certain, that Jerusalem must have been taken by Nebuchadnezzar in the November of the year A. C. 606. That prince,

however, invaded Judèa about two months before he made himself master of the capital; that is to say, immediately after the great fast of expiation, which was kept by the Jews on the tenth day of their seventh month *Tisri*, and during which Baruch read Jeremiah's roll to the people*. From this invasion of Judèa I conceive that *the seventy years* ought to be reckoned: because they were the years of the desolation of the land†: and the land began to be desolate, when it began to be devastated by the inroads of an hostile army. If then we reckon 70 years from the middle of the month *Tisri* in the year A. C. 606, we shall be brought to the middle of the month *Tisri* in the year A. C. 536. Let us proceed to inquire how far this era may be deemed a proper termination of the period.

Dr. Prideaux fixes the capture of Babylon to the very close of the year A. C. 539: but I am rather inclined to think with Abp. Usher, that it must have been taken in the spring of the following year; and I further think, that there is at least a high degree of *probability* that it was taken in the night between the last day of April and the first day of May.

* Jerem. xxxvi. 1—8. See Usser. Annal. in A. P. J. 4107. and Prideaux's Connect. Part i. B. i. p. 64.

† Jerem. xxv. 11.

It

It was taken during the celebration of a great festival in honour of the Chaldèan gods*: and, from the splendor and universality of the festival, it being celebrated (according to Xenophon) by *all* the Babylonians †, no less than by the thousand lords mentioned by Daniel, we may reasonably conclude that it was the greatest festival of this description. Now it is well known that Bel was the principal god venerated by the Babylonians; and Herodotus tells us, that there was a yearly festival observed in honour of him ‡. This very festival then in honour of Bel, and in honour likewise (I may add) of the other kindred deities (for Bel, like each of the great gods of the old mythologists, was a *panthëus*); this very festival I strongly suspect to have been observed on the night in which Babylon was taken §. Such an opinion is confirmed

* Dan. v. 4, 23.

† Cyropæd. lib. vii. p. 331. Oxon.

‡ Herod. Hist. lib. i. § 183.

§ That Babylon was taken on a *stated annual* festival of some description, and not on one *accidentally* observed, is manifest from the language of Xenophon. Ο δε Κυρος, επειδη εορτην τοιαυτην εν Βαβυλωνι ηκουσεν ειναι, εν ᾗ παντες Βαβυλωνιοι ὁλην την νυκτα πινουσι και κωμαζουσιν εν ταυτῃ—Cyrop. lib. vii. p. 331. "But Cyrus, when he had heard that a festival was celebrated "in Babylon *of such a nature*, that all the Babylonians drank "and revelled *the whole night* upon the occasion"—These words certainly imply, that Cyrus heard of its being *customary* for

confirmed by several passages of Scripture. The holy vessels of the temple at Jerusalem, which were placed by Nebuchadnezzar in the temple at Babylon * and therefore desecrated to Bel (for the Babylonian temple was the temple of Bel †), were upon this occasion brought out by Belshazzar, and polluted to the purposes of idolatrous festivity. Since therefore those vessels now formed a part of the furniture of Bel's temple, the probability is, that they were brought out specially in his honour.

for them to revel the whole of that night. He could not have heard, that they had *been* revelling the whole of the night on which he took the city, because he took it before the night was *half over:* but he heard, that it was *usual* for them to spend it in revelling. Hence he concluded, that they would do so *again;* he concluded, that he might *positively depend* upon their doing so: and he planned his measures *accordingly.* The festival therefore was not an *accidental* one, but a *fixed* or *periodical* one. This being the case, when we consider the manner in which the theological festivals of paganism were celebrated, the probability is, that it was of *a religious nature:* and, if it were at once *periodical* and *theological,* the probability further is, that it was *the great annual festival in honour of Bel,* mentioned by Herodotus. Add to this, what I have already mentioned, that Daniel expressly informs us, that part of the festival was *theological,* consisting of offering up praises to the gods; and these probabilities seem to amount to little less than certainty.

* 2 Chron. xxxvi. 7. Ezra v. 14.

† See Herod. Hist. lib. i. § 181, 182, 183.

The

The same circumstance appears to be insinuated by Isaiah. Foretelling the downfall of Babylon, and alluding to the manner in which the idol gods were wont to be drawn by oxen in portable shrines*, he exclaims, " Bel boweth down, Nebo stoopeth; " their idols are laid on the beasts and the cattle: " their burdens are heavy, a grievous weight to the

* See my Dissert. on the mysteries of the Cabiri. Vol. i. p. 35, 43, 218, 219. See also Davies's Mythology of the British Druids. p. 139, 141, 142, 171, 179. I cannot help observing, that this curious work of Mr. Davies decidedly corroborates my opinion respecting the nature and universality of the helio-arkite mysteries of the Cabiri. The scattered notices, which I was able to collect, led me to conclude that they prevailed among our Celtic ancestors, and that the history of Merlin—and the original Arthur—was mythological. This now appears very evidently to have been the case. The theology of the Druids, like that (I believe) of all the ancient nations, was composed of traditions relative to the deluge, mixed with astronomical Sabianism. They worshipped Noah in conjunction with the sun, and the ark in conjunction with the moon. Bel, Hu, and Arthur, were equally the helio-arkite patriarch. The history of Arthur is immediately connected with that of the Argonauts. He is the Arcturus of the sphere. The bard Taliesin, in his poem intitled *Spoils of the Deep*, which treats wholly of diluvian mythology, represents him as presiding in the ship, which brought himself and seven friends safe to land, when the deep swallowed up the rest of the human race. He speaks of course of the ancient Arthur, many particulars of whose history have been confounded with that of the prince of that name.

" weary

" weary beast. They crouched, they bowed down " together: they could not deliver their own charge; " even they themselves are gone into captivity *." The language of Jeremiah is exactly similar. " De- " clare ye among the nations, and publish, and set " up a standard; publish, and conceal not: say, " Babylon is taken, Bel is confounded, Merodach " is broken in pieces; her idols are confounded, " her images are broken in pieces—A drought is " upon her waters, and they shall be dried up: for " it is the land of graven images, and they are mad " upon their idols—And I will punish Bel in Baby- " lon, and I will bring forth out of his mouth that " which he hath swallowed up: and the nations " shall not flow together any more unto him: yea, " the wall of Babylon shall fall—I will do judgment " upon the graven images of Babylon, and her " whole land shall be confounded—I will do judg- " ment upon her graven images, and through all " her land the wounded shall groan †." The selection of this particular time to pour out vengeance upon Babylon perfectly accords with the general course of God's penal dispensations throughout the Old Testament. They are usually so ordered as to exhibit most conspicuously the triumphs of Jehovah over the false deities of the Gentiles. Such

* Isaiah xlvi. 1, 2. † Jerem. l. 2, 38. li. 44, 47, 52.

was

was the nature of all the plagues of Egypt*: such was the nature of the last exploit of Sampson: such was the nature of the punishment inflicted on Dagon before the ark: such was the nature of Elijah's contest with the priests of Baal: and such was the nature of the overthrow of the Syrians under Benhadad, in the days of Ahab†. There was therefore a peculiar propriety in the Almighty's so ordering it, that Babylon should be taken on the very festival of Bel: and, with this view of the subject, we shall perceive a remarkable force in the preceding denunciations of Isaiah and Jeremiah.

If then Babylon was taken on a festival of Bel, we must enquire at what time of the year the festival in question was celebrated. Herodotus mentions only *one* anniversary festival of this deity, probably on account of the superior solemnity of that one; but there appear to have been several of them. The celebration of these was fixed to the vernal equinox, May-day, the summer solstice, the first of August, and the eve of the first of November‡. Now we may determine in general, that Babylon must have been taken some time between the latter

* See this matter shewn at large in Bryant's Treatise on the Plagues of Egypt.

† Judges xvi. 23—31—1 Sam. v. 1—7. vi. 5—1 Kings xviii. 18—40—1 Kings xx. 23—29.

‡ Collect. de rebus Hibernicis. Vol. iii. p. 286.

end

end of December in the year A. C. 539, and the beginning of May in the year A. C. 538. This will appear from the following considerations. It could not have been taken earlier than December: because (as we collect from the canon of Ptolemy) it was taken 67 years and a fraction after the capture of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar, and Jerusalem was taken on the 18th of November in the year A. C. 606. Neither could it have been taken later than the May following: because two years after its capture Cyrus became sole king by the death of Darius the Mede, and in the September of the first year of his sole reign the Jews were in Jerusalem celebrating the feast of tabernacles*: but, if the decree of Cyrus for the restoration of the Jews, which was enacted in the first year of his sole reign, had been enacted later than the beginning of May, the Jews could not possibly have been in Jerusalem the September following, for we cannot allow a shorter space than four months for their journey from Babylon into their own country: hence it will follow, since Babylon was taken about two years before the commencement of the scriptural first year of Cyrus, and since this first year could not have commenced later than the beginning of May,

* Ezra iii. 1.

that

that Babylon could not have been taken later than the beginning of May.

Having thus ascertained that Babylon must have been taken between December and May, we may safely pronounce it to have been taken (if it were taken on a festival of Bel) either at the vernal equinox or on May-day, that is to say on the night preceding May-day; because the other festivals do not fall within the limited period. With respect to arranging *the 70 years*, it is immaterial *which* of these we suppose to be the epoch of the capture of Babylon: but the *latter* seems to me the most probable: both because, since the *principal* festival of Bel was then observed, and since the festival on which Babylon was taken was clearly one of *peculiar* magnificence, the presumption is, that the festival in question was the chief festival, and therefore the festival of May-eve; and because likewise, on this supposition, the triumph of Jehovah over the false deity would be more conspicuous and striking. At the beginning of May, before an alteration was produced through all the signs of the zodiac by the gradual precession of the equinoxes, the sun entered into *Taurus:* and, at that time, the great annual festival of Bel, or the solar deity worshipped in conjunction with the arkite patriarch, was universally celebrated. The custom prevailed, over a vast extent of country, from India in the east even to Britain

tain in the west*. By the Hindoos it has been immemorially observed. It appears again in the Druidical practice of kindling fires on May-eve at the top of the ancient Carns in honour of the sun, and in the designating of those sacred fires by the name of *Bealtine* or *the fires of Bel.* And vestiges of it may be detected in the kindred denomination of *Beltin*, applied even yet to May-day in the Gaelic dialect of the Scottish highlands. The same day was no less hallowed in Ireland: and the old idolatrous custom of lighting fires on May-eve in honour of Bel, of passing through them by way of purification, and of bearing in solemn procession two balls representing the sun and the moon, is still devoutly kept up in that country. The vernal season, in short, when the sun formerly entered into *the bull*, the zodiacal symbol of the great patriarch, and when all nature was reviving from the death of winter, was the special time of celebrating the helioarkite mysteries of Bel, both by the Brahmins of

* A religion fundamentally the same was established over a belt about forty degrees broad across the old continent, in a south-east and north-west direction, from the eastern shores of the Malayan peninsula to the western extremity of the British isles. See Wilford on the sacred isles of the west. Asiat. Res. vol. viii. p. 264.

India,

India, the astronomical priests of Chaldèa, and the Druids of Britain *.

Supposing

* Maurice's Ancient Hist. of Hindostan. Vol. i. p. 205, 230, 244, 258, 259—Maurice's Ind. Antiq. Vol. vi. p. 40, 41, 89—94—Toland's Hist. of the Druids. p. 67, 71—Borlase's Hist. of Cornwall. b. ii. c. 20—Davies's Mythology of the British Druids. p. 121, 133, 238, 241, 333, 369—Collect. de reb. Hibern. Vol. ii. p. 66. Vol. iii. p. 286, 502. From this last work I extract the following curious particulars, which sufficiently shew that on May-day was celebrated the chief festival of Bel.

" The Irish call the month of May *Bel-tine* or *fire of Belus*, " and the first day of May *la Bel-tine* or *the fire of Belus's day* " —Mr. Martin, in his history of the western isles of Scotland, " which were peopled by the ancient Irish, observes, that they " had a deity named *Belus* or *Belinus*, which seems to have " been the Assyrian god Bel; and probably from this pagan " deity comes the Scots term of *Beltin*, the first day of May, " having its first rise from the custom practised by the Druids " in these isles of extinguishing all the fires in the parish until " the tythes were paid, and upon payment of them the fires " were kindled in each family, and never till then—The Irish " still preserve this custom, for the fire is to this day lighted in " the milking yards: the men, women, and children, for the " same reason pass through or leap over the sacred fires; and " the cattle are driven through the flames of the burning straw " on the first of May. In some parts, as the counties of Wa- " terford and Kilkenny, the brides, married since the last " May-day, are compelled to furnish the young people with a " ball covered with gold-lace, and another covered with silver- " lace, finely adorned with silver tassils. These balls, the

" symbols

Supposing Babylon to have fallen on May-eve in the year A. C. 538, an opinion which very well corresponds with the arrangement of Abp. Usher*,

" symbols of the sun and moon, are suspended in a hoop orna-
" mented with flowers, which hoop represents the circular path
" of Belus or the sun: and in this manner they walk in pro-
" cession from house to house—The month of May was indeed
" the most proper season of the year to acknowledge the bene-
" ficent favours of Belus or the sun; because in May that
" great planet begins to beautify the face of the earth, to nou-
" rish its decayed plants and vegetables, and to put life and
" warmth into its animal beings—Hence it was, without doubt,
" that almost every pagan nation adored this beautiful planet
" as the parent of nature, under different names and appella-
" tions; a religion, which took its rise in Chaldèa, and was
" soon carried into Egypt, and from thence to Greece. It
" spread itself also to the most distant parts of the world; and
" infected, not only the eastern and western Scythians and
" Tartars, but the Mexicans too, for the Spaniards found it
" there—The ancient practice of adoring the sun, by the sym-
" bol of fire, was first introduced into the world by Nimrod—
" This idolatrous mode of worship soon overspread the earth.
" The Canaanites or Phenicians observed it in the same man-
" ner with the pagan Irish. We read it in the 4th book of
" Kings, that they served Baal, and religiously passed their
" sons and daughters through his fire, in which they were imi-
" tated by the idolatrous Israelites."

The custom of dancing round a May-pole is a relic of one part of the rites of Bel, however ignorant the dancers may be of the nature of their festivity. But enough has been said on the subject.

* See Usser. Annal. in A. A. C. 538.

the

the two years of Darius, reckoned from that time, will bring us to the spring of the year A. C. 536: that is to say, still agreeably to the arrangement of Usher *, the first year of Cyrus must have commenced in this same spring, probably about April or perhaps March. And, almost immediately after his accession to sole empire, his decree in favour of the Jews must have been enacted: for, as I have already observed, we cannot allow a shorter space than four months for their journey home; and we find them celebrating their first feast of tabernacles in the seventh month *Tisri*, or in the September of this year.

Now we have previously seen, that 70 years, reckoned from the middle of the month *Tisri* in the year A. C. 606, when Nebuchadnezzar invaded Judèa, will bring us to the middle of the month *Tisri* in the year A. C. 536: and we now find, that, exactly in the middle of this month in this year, the Jews after their arrival in their own land were celebrating the feast of tabernacles in their capital city. At this time therefore I conceive *the seventy years* of the predicted desolation of the land to have expired: for, as that desolation commenced with Nebuchadnezzar's devastating invasion of the land, so the point of its termination is solemnly and natu-

* See Usser. Annal. in A. A. C. 536.

rally

rally marked by the celebration of one of the great festivals in Jerusalem now first beginning to recover from its desolate condition.

The preceding arrangement of *the seventy years* I prefer both to that of Usher and to that of Prideaux. Usher, by reckoning from the supposed binding of Jehoiakim in the spring of the year A. C. 606 to the enacting of the decree of Cyrus in the spring of the year A. C. 536, produces, no doubt, the sum of 70 years: but then he places the capture of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar a year *too early*. Prideaux, on the contrary, places the capture of Jerusalem where it *ought* to be placed: but, in order to make up the sum of 70 years, he is obliged to throw forward the edict of Cyrus to the latter end of the year A. C. 536, that is to say, to the latter end of his first year instead of its beginning. This compels him to place the first feast of tabernacles in the *Tisri* of the year A. C. 535, or in the *second* year of Cyrus: whereas, as Abp. Usher rightly judges, it manifestly appears from Ezra to have been celebrated in his *first* year, because no other year is mentioned *. In addition to their respective *peculiar*

* Ezra, after stating that the Jews began to return in *the first year* of Cyrus, tells us, that in *the seventh month* they gathered themselves together to Jerusalem; and this he tells us *without* specifying any other year than *the first year* of Cyrus. Having

peculiar errors, these two arrangements appear to me to be equally faulty in making *the seventy years* terminate with the enacting of the decree of Cyrus. Josephus tells us, that the Jews began to return from Babylon in the *seventieth* year: therefore they *began* to return *before* the seventy years had *fully* expired; and therefore the years themselves must have expired *after* their arrival in Palestine, which is precisely what my hypothesis supposes them to have done*.

(3.) Mr.

Having told us this, he immediately afterwards speaks of *the second month* of *the second year* of their coming to the house of God, thereby plainly intimating that *another* year had commenced. This being the case, *the seventh month* must have been in *the first year* of their coming to the house of God: and, since Ezra mentions this *seventh month* after speaking of *the first year* of Cyrus without specifying the commencement of *the second year* of that prince, *the seventh month* must be that *seventh month* which fell out in *the first year* of Cyrus. Compare Ezra i. 1. iii. 1, 8.

* Joseph. Ant. Jud. lib. xi. cap. 1. § 1. It may be objected, that Jeremiah speaks of *the seventy years* being accomplished *at* or *in* Babylon, which, according to the present hypothesis, they were *not* (Jerem. xxix. 10.)—I reply, that the prophet here plainly speaks of *the seventy years* in the round language of familiar conversation: for, in *perfect* strictness of speech, the Jews were not *in* Babylon seventy years *complete* according to *any* interpretation. Those, who make this period *terminate* in *Babylon* with the enacting of the decree of Cyrus, make it *commence* in *Palestine* with the capture of *Jerusalem*. The se-

 venty

(3.) Mr. Marshall's third argument is deduced from the circumstance of the three years and a half being

venty years however are *the period of the desolation of Judah and Jerusalem*, reckoned from the time when that desolation commenced to the time when it began to cease. Both the city and the country might be a considerable time *in recovering* from their desolate state; but *the seventy years* expired, when they *began* to recover: and no fixed era seems to mark this beginning more naturally and more definitely than *the first celebration of one of the great festivals in the capital city after an interruption of many years and immediately after the arrival of the Jews in their own country.*

I have frequently wondered, that Dr. Prideaux should imagine, that Jeremiah's prophecy of *the seventy years* received a triple accomplishment in *three* different periods of seventy years each, when we are so plainly told in Scripture, that the instrument, which produced its accomplishment, was the decree of Cyrus, and when we are moreover informed, that, in the first year of Darius, shortly before the enacting of this decree, Daniel had calculated *the seventy years* to have nearly expired (See Ezra i. 1. and Dan. ix. 1, 2.). Such being the case, we surely have no right to look out for other imaginary accomplishments of the prophecy according to our own contriving. I perfectly agree with Dr. Blayney, that the two periods of seventy years each, mentioned in Zechar. i. 12, and vii. 5, have no sort of connection with *the seventy years* foretold by Jeremiah: neither does Zechariah himself say any thing, which necessarily leads us to suppose that he alludes in either case to Jeremiah's *seventy years* (See Blayney's trans. of Jeremiah and Zechariah in loc.) One mischief, that has resulted from Dr. Prideaux's scheme of a triple accomplishment, is the application

being described as containing 1260 days, which is at the rate of 360 days to the year. Now three years and a half are a *collective* sum, and yet contain no more than 1260 days: hence he infers, that 490 years, being also a *collective* sum, ought to be estimated as containing no more than 490 times 360 days.

I have already in part answered this argument by observing, that, if the ancient year used by the Jews consisted of 12 months of 30 days each *and of 5 supernumerary days added at the end of the year* and considered as belonging to *none* of the months; the year, when reckoned by months (as St. John reckons it*), must then be estimated as containing

tion of the same principle to the prophecies which treat of *the* 1260 *years*. It has been argued, that, as the prophecy of *the seventy years* received different successive accomplishments, we may expect that *the* 1260 *years* have more than one era of commencement and termination. The conclusion might perhaps have been warranted from analogy, if the premises, whence it is drawn, had been well founded. But, since Ezra tells us that Jeremiah's *seventy years* expired in the first year of Cyrus, and since no intimation is given in Scripture that they likewise expired at other eras, I can consider the hypothesis of Dr. Prideaux in no other light than that of a mere gratuitous unproved assumption, and can never allow it to be the basis of an analogical argument. See Prideaux's Connect. Part i. B. iii.

* Rev. xi. 2.

no more than 360 days: consequently, if he ascribed 42 *precise* months to three years and a half, he must likewise ascribe to them 1260 *precise* days, because each of those months contained exactly 30 days: and, in fact, such a mode of reckoning would naturally arise from the year being *reputed* to contain no more than 360 days. I may now further observe, that, if the ancient year of the Jews contained *singularly* no more than 360 days, and if the deficiency in *collective* sums were made up by intercalations; it is easy to conceive, from the arbitrary and irregular mode in which the Sanhedrim intercalated, that any given three years and a half, being a *very short* collective period, might *really* contain no more than 1260 days, while a *longer* collective period could not possibly have been suffered to roll on without being extended to its proper amount by the requisite intercalations. We can as little argue with certainty from a *very short* collective period into which no intercalation might be introduced, as we can from the amount of a single *individual* year. If Mr. Marshall could have shewn, that, not *three years and a half*, but 80 or 100 *years*, of 360 days each, had been suffered to elapse without any intercalary regulation, he would then indeed have adduced a most formidable argument.

(4.) He further attempts to prove his point by pursuing another train of reasoning—In the time of Noah,

Noah, five months were equal to 150 days; therefore each month must have contained 30 days. But, in the time of Solomon, exactly *twelve* purveyors made provision throughout the year for the royal household, each man his month: therefore, since each month contained 30 days, twelve such months or the whole year must have contained 360 days—Now, throughout the whole Bible no mention is made of *intercalation;* and moreover any intercalation of the *Ve Adar* or *thirteenth month* of the Sanhedrim would necessarily have disturbed the economical arrangement of Solomon, because that prince employed no more than *twelve* purveyors throughout the year: therefore we may conclude, that such an expedient was formerly altogether unknown—But, if each year contained exactly 360 days, and if the expedient of intercalation was never resorted to; it will follow, that, in the ancient Jewish chronology, the year both *singularly* and *collectively* contained no more than 360 days.

This argument, though not destitute of speciousness, is founded on a position by no means proved; namely, that the old Jewish year did *really* contain no more than 360 days. I have already intimated, that this position is *not* established by the circumstance of five Noetic months being equal to 150 days, because this would equally be the case, whether the year consisted of *no more* than 12 months of

of 30 days each, or of 12 months of 30 days each *and five additional days not considered as belonging to any month.* And I think it as little established by the arrangement of Solomon's purveyorships. That prince merely considered the convenience of his household; and it was a matter of perfect indifference to him, whether his artificial year, which for the purposes of division consists of a number peculiarly convenient, coincided with the natural year or not. Matters would still go on smoothly; and each purveyor, knowing exactly the rotation of his turn, would be prepared to discharge his duty without having it in his power to complain that *his* month contained more days than those of some of his *colleagues.* But we can as little conclude from this arrangement, that the *entire* Jewish year contained no more than 360 days; as any future chronologer could conclude, that the *entire* English year contained only 364 days, from an arrangement (if any such were in existence) that 52 officers should successively be in waiting upon the king throughout the year, each man taking his week from the Sunday to the Saturday.

4. The sum of that argument of Mr. Marshall, which I have just considered, amounts to this: *the ancient Jewish year contained 360 days; no monthly intercalation was used, because Scripture is wholly silent respecting it; therefore any collective sum of years*

years is equivalent only to the same sum of unintercalated years of 360 *days each*—As I think his premises labour under a deficiency of proof, I deny his conclusion: yet the opinion advanced in the second step of the syllogism appears to be not unwarrantable. Let us invert his reasoning, and see whether the truth cannot be thus elicited.

No mention is made in Scripture of intercalary months: therefore, since various festivals at particular seasons are ordained with much minuteness of circumstance in the Levitical dispensation, the probability is, that intercalary months, being wholly unnoticed, were not known to the more ancient Jews—The circumstance of five months being equal to 150 days, proves that each month contained 30 days: and, since the year contained 12 such months, it must have contained 360 days; but, whether it contained them *simply*, or *with the addition of five supernumerary days not included in any one of the months*, is not positively declared—If then there were no monthly intercalations, the Jewish year *must* have been, *collectively* no less than *singularly*, of one or other of these forms: that is to say, a series of Jewish years must inevitably have been equal either to a corresponding series of years of 360 days each, or to a corresponding series of years of 365 days each.

So

So far is certain: the question therefore is, *which* of the two forms was that of the ancient Jewish year. Mr. Marshall maintains, that the *first* was: I am rather inclined to maintain, that the *second* was; and to maintain this position in such a manner, as to believe that a leap-day was occasionally intercalated to keep the seasons in their proper places.

My reasons for adhering to such an opinion are the following.

(1.) From the very time of the original institution of *the Passover*, the observance of it was fixed to the fourteenth day of the first month *Nisan*, otherwise called *Abib*, or *the month of green ears*, at which time in Judèa the harvest was beginning: and, in a similar manner, *the feast of tabernacles* was fixed to the middle of the seventh month *Tisri*, and to the time of the ending of the vintage.

Now these feasts were thus observed—*The Passover* they celebrated on the fourteenth day of *Nisan* or *Abib*, by killing the paschal lamb: the fifteenth day was the first of the days of unleavened bread, and was ordained to be kept as a sabbath: and, on the morrow after this sabbath, as being the beginning of the barley-harvest, they were directed to bring a sheaf of the first-fruits for a wave-offering before the Lord—*The feast of tabernacles* they celebrated on the fifteenth day of *Tisri:* and this festival was also called *the feast of in-gathering*, because

cause it was observed after they had gathered in their corn and their wine.

If then, as Mr. Marshall maintains, the ancient Jewish year consisted of *no more* than 360 days, *without* the addition of five supernumerary days and *without* being regulated by monthly intercalations (of which there is no mention in Scripture); it is evident, that *all* the months, and among them the months *Abib* and *Tisri*, must have rapidly revolved through the several seasons of the year. Whence it is equally evident, since *the Passover* and *the feast of tabernacles* were fixed, the one to the fourteenth day of *Abib*, and the other to the fifteenth day of *Tisri*, that *they* must similarly have revolved through the seasons.

Such a revolution of the great festivals must necessarily have taken place, if Mr. Marshall's hypothesis be well founded; inasmuch as, without *any* intercalations or additions, it assigns precisely 360 days to the Jewish year, *collectively* as well as *singly*. This being undeniably the case, it may be asked, how would it be possible to observe the ordinances of the Law when the months *Abib* and *Tisri* had passed into opposite seasons of the solar year? How could the Jews, in the climate of Judèa, offer the first-fruits of their harvest after *the Passover*, when the month *Abib*, in which it was celebrated, had passed into autumn or winter? And how could

could they observe *the feast of tabernacles*, as a feast of the in-gathering of their corn and their wine, in the month *Tisri*, when that month had passed into spring or summer? It is plain, that, unless *Abib* and *Tisri* always kept their places in the solar year, unless *Abib* were always a vernal month, and *Tisri* an autumnal month, *the passover* and *the feast of tabernacles* could not have been duly observed: whence it is no less plain, that the ancient Jews could not have reckoned by years of 360 days each without *some* expedient to make those years fall in with solar years. Since therefore we know that their year consisted of 12 months of 30 days each, and since no mention is made in Scripture of any intercalary month; I conclude, that, like the Egyptians, they added to the end of their year five supernumerary days.

(2.) As *the passover* and *feast of tabernacles* could only be celebrated either by solar years or by years made equivalent to solar years, so the period of years between jubilee and jubilee must by some expedient or another have been made equal to the same period of solar years. The Levitical weeks of years all began from the first day of the month *Tisri;* and, in the middle of this month, as I have just observed, *the feast of tabernacles* was celebrated, which fixed it to the autumnal season of the solar year. This being the case, a period, reckoned from

from autumn to autumn, must necessarily be equal to a period of the same number of solar years *.

(3.) The 430 years of the sojourning of the children of Israel must plainly be computed in the same manner. The celebration of *the passover* was ordained on the fourteenth day of the first month, which was called *Nisan* or *Abib;* and, on the following day, or the fifteenth, the children of Israel left the land of Egypt. Upon this circumstance the inspired historian makes the following remarkable observation. " Now the sojourning of the " children of Israel, who dwelt in Egypt, was four " hundred and thirty years. And it came to pass " at the end of the four hundred and thirty years, " *even the self-same day it came to pass*, that all " the hosts of the Lord went out from the land of " Egypt. It is a night to be much observed unto " the Lord for bringing them out from the land of " Egypt: this is that night of the Lord to be ob- " served of all the children of Israel in their gene- " rations †." It appears then, that *precisely* at the end of the 430 years even to the very day, *precisely* on the fifteenth day of the first month, *the month* (as it was styled) *of green ears*, the children of Is-

* See Levit. xxv. 8—11. Deut. xxxi. 10. Prideaux's Connection. Part i. b. v. p. 293. Calmet's Dictionary. Voc. *Jubilee—Feast of tabernacles.*

† Exod. xii. 40, 41, 42.

rael

rael quitted the land of Egypt. But this month *Abib* is fixed to a particular season of the solar year; because, immediately after the celebration of *the passover* on its fourteenth day, the first-fruits of the harvest were appointed to be offered unto the Lord. Its very name indeed, *the month of green ears*, proves that it did *not* circulate through the year, as Mr. Marshall's hypothesis necessarily supposes: for, *had* it circulated, that name must, during by far the greater part of its circulation, have been absurdly improper. It is plain therefore, from the circumstance of the fifteenth day of the first month being specified as the *very* day *after* the expiration of the 430 years, and from the declaration that the deliverance out of Egypt took place *exactly* at the end of 430 years even to this *very day* the fifteenth day of the first month, that the first day of those 430 years must necessarily be likewise the fifteenth day of the same month *Abib* or *Nisan*. This being allowed, it is equally plain, that the 430 years must either be solar years or collectively equivalent to the same number of solar years; because by no other computation could the first day of the first year and the first day of the four hundred and thirty first year be alike the fifteenth day of a month, fixed, as its very name of *Abib* implies, to the spring season of the year. Hence chronologers, with much reason, compute backward from the Exodus to the

call

call of Abraham 430 solar years; because so long was the period of the sojournings of the children of Israel, either in their own persons or in those of their patriarchal progenitors, to the time of their migrating from the land of Egypt: and hence they with equal justice place the 400 years predicted to Abraham immediately by God himself* (which necessarily conterminate with the 430 years) so as to commence 30 years after the commencement of the 430 years †.

(4.) In

* Gen. xv. 13.

† " Ablactato Isaaco, fecit Abraham convivium magnum. " Et videns Sarah filium Hagaræ Ægyptiæ ludentem, vel potius deludentem et contumeliosè tractantem (sicut Gen. " xxxix. 14. vox ea accipitur), imo persequentem (ut Gal. " iv. 29. explicat Apostolus), Isaacum; ut qui sibi, primogenituræ ratione, hæreditatem deberi jactitaret; dixit Abrahamo, *Ejice ancillam istam et filium ejus, non enim futurus est " hæres filius ancillæ istius cum filio meo, cum Isaaco.* Quod " licet ægerrimè primum ille ferret, perfecit tamen, accedente " jussu Dei, illi edicentis, *In Isaaco vocabitur tibi semen* (Gen. " xxi. 8—12. cum Rom. ix. 7, 8. et Heb. xi. 17, 18. ubi observa Isaacum hac ratione *unigenitum* illius filium appellatum). *Inter Hebræos autem varia opinio est, asserentibus aliis " quinto anno ablactationis tempus statutum aliis duodecimum " annum vendicantibus. Nos igitur, ut breviorem eligamus ætatem, post decem et octo annos Ismael supputavimus ejectum esse " cum matre:* inquit Hieronymus, Traditionibus Hebraicis in " Genesim. Unde ab hac electi seminis designatione et persecutione (ut appellat Apostolus), quam a filio Ægyptiæ " sustinuit,

(4.) In short, if the lunar year of 360 days were used by the ancient Jews without either the requisite addition of supernumerary days at the end of each year, or the due occasional intercalation of a month, it will be impossible to reconcile their history with the histories of other ancient nations connected with them. The duration of the several reigns of their kings both over Judah and Israel is regularly specified, and the contemporaneousness of those kings with the neighbouring sovereigns is likewise specified, as must obviously be the case in the history of *any* people. Consequently, as it was well observed by Lyranus, those, who represent the Hebrews as computing collectively by lunar years, dislocate the whole chronological series of the Old Testament *.

5. The

" sustinuit, 400 annorum initium complures deducunt; qui-
" bus Abrahami semen perigrinum futurum in terra non sua
" et affligendum Deus prædixerat (Gen. xv. 13. Acts vii. 6.).
" In exitu enim Israelitarum ex Ægypto eos terminandos esse,
" ex Gen. xv. 14. et Exod. xii. 35, 36. inter se collatis liquet.
" Quanquam Glossa ordinaria ex Augustino initium annorum
" istorum ad ipsam nativitatem Isaaci referat: ac si 405
" annos, summa solida et numero rotundo, 400 Scriptura dix-
" erit." Usser. Annal. in ann. A. C. 1891.

* " Quia scriptura passim non lunaribus, sed communibus
" et solaribus, utitur annis; et quia, licet Hebræi uterentur
" annis lunaribus, tamen tertio quoque anno, ex diebus qui

" excreverant,

5. The sum of the matter is this. Since no mention is made in Scripture of intercalary months, and since therefore the probability is, that they were not used by the more ancient Jews; I conclude, in opposition to Mr. Marshall, that, if such months were *not* used by them, their year *must* have consisted, not of 12 months of 30 days each *only* (as that author maintains it to have consisted, *collectively* no less than *singularly*), but of 12 months of 30 days each *and five supernumerary days not included in any of the months:* and I moreover conclude, that an intercalation of a day must have been occasionally used to preserve the seasons in their proper places.

6. But, whether the more ancient Jews used this year or a year of 360 days corrected by monthly

" excreverant, mensem addebant, et sic per embolismos annos " lunares æquabant solaribus, tum ut chronicis et chronologiæ " aliarum gentium se suaque accommodarent, tum propter " Pascha et Pentecosten; ut illa congruo tempore a lege sta- " tuto, puta post æquinoctium vernum 14 to die primi mensis " semper celebrarent: alioqui enim, cum annus lunaris minor " sit solari, sæpe Pascha celebrare debuissent vel ante æqui- " noctium vernum, vel alio mense quam primo. Unde Lyra- " nus, qui origine fuit Hebræus et in Hebræorum rebus ver- " satissimus, *Falluntur*, inquit, *qui putant Hebræos talibus* " (lunaribus) *annis usos aliquando; alioquin tota veteris instru-* " *menti series vacillat.* Idem asserit Galatinus. lib. iv. c. 14." Cornel. a Lapid. Comment. in Dan. ix. 25.

intercalations

intercalations (and *one* or the *other* they *must* have used), is a matter of very little moment to the present question. Their two great festivals, being fixed both to *a particular month* and to *a particular season* of the year, prove (as it appears to me) beyond a possibility of doubt, that by some expedient or other the months *Abib* and *Tisri* were always made to fall out in spring and autumn: and, if this be evident, as it must be from the mode of celebrating those two great festivals, then it will follow, equally beyond a possibility of a doubt, that, whatever might be the form of a *single* Jewish year, a series of them taken *collectively* must have been equal to a corresponding series of natural solar years. Hence I conclude, that the 490 years of *the seventy weeks* are in effect and collectively 490 solar years, and not (as Mr. Marshall contends) 490 years of 360 days each, or about 483 solar years.

III. Although, as I have just intimated, it is sufficient for my purpose to have shewn that a series of Jewish years, whatever might be their *individual* form, was *collectively* equal to a corresponding series of solar years, it may not be amiss at the close of the present discussion to adduce from writers, who have considered the subject as fully as Mr. Marshall, some additional remarks on the chronology of the Hebrews.

1. "Abra-

1. " Abraham, who was a practical astronomer," says Mr. Jackson, " brought the Chaldèan year " into Canaan, which was the Noachic and origi- " nal year of the world: but, as he settled amongst " the Canaanites, he probably used their year, " which commenced about the autumnal equinox, " as Taaut or Thoth, the son of Misor or Mizraim, " had settled it in Phenicia and afterwards in " Egypt, according to the history of Sanchoniatho. " However Abraham, no doubt, preserved the me- " mory of the epoch of the Chaldèan year in his " family and amongst his posterity. When the " Israelites went into Egypt, they used the Egyp- " tian year, which had the same epoch with the " Phenician: but, at their exodus, they were com- " manded by God to begin the year at the original " epoch of it, which was the vernal equinox; and " to use this epoch only in their sacred institutions, " their feasts and fasts, and all religious matters: " but in civil affairs they still retained the epoch of " the Egyptian year. So the ecclesiastical year of " the Hebrews began at the vernal equinox, and all " their sacred rites were regulated by it: and the " Sabbatical and Jubilean years began at the au- " tumnal equinox. The months were counted from " the vernal epoch of the year only. Hence the " month *Abib* or *Nisan*, which before was the se- " venth month, was reckoned, by God's command

" to Moses, the first month of the year: and that,
" which had been called *the first*, was thenceforth
" called *the seventh*. Thus the Chaldee Para-
" phrast, on 1 Kings viii. 2, says, the month *Etha-*
" *nim*, which by the ancients was called *the first*,
" is now called *the seventh*.

" This account of the old and new year of the
" Hebrews is evident from Scripture. In Exod.
" xxiii. 16, the seventh month, in which was cele-
" brated *the feast of the ingathering of all the*
" *fruits of the land*, and in which they dwelt in
" tabernacles seven days counted from the fifteenth
" day inclusive, is said *to be in the end of the year:*
" and so in Deut. xxxi. 10. The same feast is
" said, Exod. xxxiv. 22, *to be at the revolution*
" (Tecuphath) *of the year;* that is, the cardinal
" point, when the old year began at the autumnal
" equinox; and which was the seventh month from
" the vernal equinox, which was the epoch of the
" new ecclesiastical year. The Greek interpreters
" render Tecuphath *the dividing* or *middle of the*
" *year* *. And so it was: for *the feast of taber-*
" *nacles* for seven days, immediately after *the in-*
" *gathering of all the fruit of the land*, was ap-
" pointed to begin on the fifteenth day of the se-
" venth month †; and this was exactly the middle

* Μεσουντος του ενιαυτου. † Levit. xxiii. 34, 39—44.

of

" of the year, or six months from the fifteenth day
" of the first month *Abib* or *Nisan*, which was the
" first day of *the feast of unleavened bread*, with
" which the year began.

" Now it may hence be inferred, that the eccle-
" siastical, as well as the civil, year of the Jews
" was solar, and not lunar: and, had the months
" been lunar, there would be more than six of them
" from the *Tecuphath* or cardinal point of the ver-
" nal, to the *Tecuphath* of the autumnal equinox;
" nor could the *Tecuphath* of the seventh month be
" the middle of any but the solar year. Besides,
" as the Egyptian year both for religious and civil
" use was solar only, the Hebrew year would natu-
" rally be solar also, unless it was by express com-
" mand from God made lunar; of which there is
" no testimony or evidence. It is likewise proba-
" ble, that the fifteenth day of the month *Abib* or
" *Nisan* commenced with the sun's entrance into
" the vernal equinoctial point of the zodiac, to
" which the year was fixed. When the Israelites
" went into Egypt, they knew no other than the
" Chaldèan lunisolar year of 360 days, which Abra-
" ham brought into Canaan, and which probably
" was the same with the Phenician and Egyptian
" year, but commenced from a different epoch.
" Whether any, or what, intercalation was then
" used to reduce it nearer to the tropical year, is

" not known*. But, not long after the time that " the Israelites were come into Egypt, it was dis- " covered there by the Egyptian priests, that the " solar year consisted of 365 days: and five inter- " calary days were thenceforth added in their ca- " lendar at the end of the last month of the year. " This is related by Africanus or Syncellus, from " the Egyptian annals, to have been done in the " reign of Assis, the last shepherd king, who began " to reign in the year before Christ 1772. This " improved Egyptian year the Israelites brought " with them out of Egypt; and Moses, by God's " command, changed the epoch of it from the au- " tumnal to the vernal equinox: and we may con- " clude, that the five intercalary days were added " by Moses at the end of the twelfth month.

* That *some* method must have been used to reduce this year to the solar form either *individually* or *collectively*, if it were used by Abraham, seems to me to be manifest from the circumstance of *the* 430 *years* of the sojournings of the children of Israel being said to have been fulfilled *even to a day* on the fourteenth day of the first month; which, as its name *Abib* implies, being fixed to a particular season of the year, could not have circulated. If then 430 years be reckoned from the fifteenth of one *Abib* to the fifteenth of another *Abib*, they must necessarily be either solar years, or years collectively equivalent to solar years: consequently, if Abraham used the year of 360 days, he must either have added five days to the end of each year, or occasionally have intercalated it by the addition of a month.

The

" The memorials of the two *Tecuphaths*, or heads " of the year, the one at the vernal, the other at the " autumnal, equinox, were celebrated by two festivals: the first, by *the feast of the passover and* " *unleavened bread*, on the fifteenth day of the first " month; the second, by *the feast of tabernacles*, " which began on the fifteenth day of the seventh " month *, as the fifteenth day of the first month " *Abib* was the first day of unleavened bread. The " Jewish year, both sacred and civil, was solar only, " consisting of 365 days, and was fixed to the two " equinoctial points of the zodiac. This year is " undoubtedly used by Moses in his history of the " creation and of the genealogies of the patriarchs " both before and after the flood. And, as there " is not in the law of Moses any mention of a lunar " year at all, or of any intercalations of the sacred " year, but only of the beginning of the year being " transferred from the autumnal to the vernal equi- " nox, we may infer with great certainty, that the " year instituted by Moses was a fixed solar year; " and that *the passover* was fixed to the fourteenth " day of the first month; and all the other festivals " and religious institutions were also fixed to the " same immoveable days of the year as well as " months, without any regard, as far as appears,

* Levit. xxiii. 34. Numb. xxix. 12.

" to

" to the new or full moons. And if, as Maimo-
" nides and the modern Jews tell us, the last month
" *Adar* was frequently intercalated (as a lunar year
" required) to bring the fourteenth or fifteenth day
" of the first month *Nisan* to the cardinal point of
" the vernal equinox, or after it: if any such inter-
" calations had been used by Moses or in the an-
" cient times of the Jewish economy, this so re-
" markable alteration of the course of the year,
" from the solar universally used, to the lunar no
" where known or used in the time of Moses, that
" we find, or long after, must have been somewhere
" taken notice of: and the intercalary months would
" have been mentioned and settled, to avoid bring-
" ing confusion into their religious observances.
" On the other hand, if the year was merely solar,
" and the *Chodesh*, so often mentioned in the writ-
" ings of Moses, meant always *the month only*, as
" it undoubtedly in general does, without any re-
" ference to or intimation of *the moon* or *a lunar*
" *month distinct from the solar* which was uniform
" and equable, then all is easy: and the fourteenth
" day of the first *Chodesh* or month would be a
" fixed point of the year and kept immoveable by
" the intercalation of a day in about four years
" added to the other five intercalary days; which
" was the most ancient method of intercalating the
" solar year.

" It

" It is probable, that the Jews borrowed their " lunar year from the Greeks, many ages after the " time of Moses, and not before they were subject " to them: and then intercalary months became " necessary; and were added as the season of the " spring and the ripening of the barley harvest re- " quired, which was to be reaped in the first month " which commenced at the new moon, that the first " day of the passover might be celebrated at the " time of the full moon. This month was called " *Abib** from the earing of corn, and was the " month in which they came out of Egypt. If the " corn happened not to be ripe enough to reap be- " fore the sixteenth day of that month, when the " first fruits were offered at *the passover* on the " second day of unleavened bread, which was the " sixteenth day of the month†, an intercalary " month was added after the last month of the " year, that the barley harvest might be ready to " reap at *the passover*. But this was changing the " ordinance of Moses by putting one month in the " place of another: for the intercalated month " threw all the months forward; and so *Nisan*, the " first month, possessed the place of the second, " and so on. Rabbi Moses Maimonides tells us,

* Exod. xii. 2. xiii. 4. xxxiv. 18. Deut. xvi. 1.

† Levit. xxiii. 6, 9, 10, 11, 15.

" that

" that the intercalary year was instituted for three
" reasons. The first was on account of the equi-
" nox, that is, to bring it to the fifteenth day of the
" month *Nisan* or before; so, if the equinox was
" like to happen on the sixteenth day or later, an
" intercalary month was added before it. A se-
" cond reason was on account of the corn, that it
" might be ripe at *the passover*, when it was to be
" reaped and the first fruits to be offered. The
" third reason was on account of the fruit or ber-
" ries of trees, which was then to be gathered *.
" Morinus cites an ancient Jewish writer, called
" *Rabbi Eliezer*, who (he thinks) was contempo-
" rary with St. Paul, to shew that the intercalary
" year depended chiefly on the winter solstice;
" and, if it fell on the twentieth day of the month
" *Tebeth* (December) or later, they intercalated the
" year of course, concluding the corn harvest could
" not naturally be ready to reap by the fifteenth of
" *Nisan:* but, if the solstice happened sooner, then

* " Tribus de causis annus intercalaris instituebatur. Pri-
" mo, propter æquinoctium. Deinde, propter terræ fruges.
" Tertio, propter arborum baccas: ut, si ex tabularum ra-
" tione concilium intelligeret æquinoctium, aut decimo et
" sexto die *Nisan* futurum esse, aut etiam posterius, alterum
" anno mensem *Adar* adderet; ut cum *Pascha* adesset frugum
" maturitas: quæ causa quidem cum esset, annus constitue-
" batur intercalaris, nec ulla causa quærebatur alia." Tract.
de ration. intercal. c. iv. p. 356, 357.

" they

" they had regard to the ripening of the corn and " fruit of trees, which, if they proved more back- " ward than common, occasioned the year on their " account to be intercalated, so that sometimes " they intercalated two years together*. This " shews, that, after the Jews used lunar months, " their intercalations could not be regular, because " they annually depended both on the day of the " month on which the winter solstice fell, which " day was moveable, and on the maturity of the " barley harvest in the sixteenth day of *Nisan*, " which was sometimes before and sometimes after " the vernal equinox; and yet *the passover* was " fixed to the fourteenth day of the month *Nisan*. " The Jews, who first used the lunar months, seem

* " Intercalant annum super *Thecuphas*, modo *Thecupha* " contigerit a vicesimo die mensis *Tebeth*, et infra. *Morinus* " *adds*, Si solstitium hybernum commissum fuerit vicesimo die " mensis *Tebeth* (Decembris), vel posthæc, intercalatur annus, " nulla habita spicarum et frugum ratione: nam tum certum " est ex consueto naturæ ordine ista non satis matura fore, " ut decima quinta *Nisan* spicarum manipulus Deo offeratur. " Si vero solstitium hybernum citius committatur, tum frugum " ratio habetur, et intercalatio fit, ambæ si serotinæ fuerint. " Hinc nonnunquam apud eos *duobus annis continuis* intercala- " batur. Fundamentum et clavem intercalationis propter " *Thecupham* posteriores Judæi a decima sexta. *Nisan* de- " duxerunt: sed priores a vicesima *Tebeth*." In Pentateuch. Samar. Exercit. i. p. 39, 40, 51, 52.

" to have principally minded to make the new moon
" of *Nisan* that which was nearest to the vernal
" equinox, whether before or after it; that *the*
" *passover* might fall on the full moon, which was
" either at or after it. And, as the use of lunar
" months made the keeping of the passover very
" irregular, we may with the greatest reason con-
" clude that the original Jewish year and months
" both before and after their exodus were solar
" only—

" In the intercalary year, the thirteenth month,
" called *Ve-Adar*, which was a second *Adar* of 29
" days*, was added after *Adar;* which then had
" 30 days, and made the year 384 days. In a
" cycle of 19 years they must have seven interca-
" lary months to bring the fifteenth of *Nisan* to the

* " Qui annus fiebat uno mense longior, is *intercalaris* ap-
" pellabatur: sed nullus addebatur unquam anno alius quam
" mensis *Adar*. Itaque anno intercalari menses *Adar* bini
" continuabantur, atque iidem *Adar primus* et *Adar secundus*
" dicebantur. Quid ita vero? nimirum ut haberetur una
" cum messe *Pascha*, quippe cum in Lege sit, *Observato men-*
" *sem novarum frugum;* hujus enim verbi vis ea fuit, ut tem-
" poris observandi rationem teneres eam, quæ mensem hunc
" ad messem adduceret: atque nisi alterum anno mensem
" *Adar* adderes, tum *Pascha* hybernis tum æstivis accideret
" temporibus." Maimon. de rat. intercal. c. iv. p. 356.
" Anno intercalari, quoniam *Adar* numerantur duo, primus
" eorum sit plenus, alter cavus." c. viii. p. 376.

" equinoctial

" equinoctial point, as the law required: and there-
" fore, if they followed in their lunar year the cycle
" of Meton of 19 years, as some Jewish and many
" Christian writers suppose, they could keep *the*
" *passover*, as the law required, on the fifteenth of
" *Nisan* and at the equinox, once only in the space
" of 19 years. Had the Jews, when they used the
" lunar year, intercalated it with sometimes ten and
" sometimes eleven days after the twelfth month
" annually, they would have always kept the fif-
" teenth of *Nisan* to the vernal equinox, which was
" the original institution of Moses. But, as they
" thought they ought not to celebrate *the passover*
" till the corn was ripe and the berries of trees were
" ready for gathering, although the equinox hap-
" pened before the sixteenth day of *Nisan;* if these
" were not then ripe, they intercalated a whole
" month *.

" The intercalated years in the Jewish cycle of
" 19 years were, as Maimonides relates †, the

* " Jam si seges esset tardior quam ut posset ad *Pascha*
" meti, nec dum baccas, quæ solebant tempore paschali, pro-
" fuderant arbores; hac duplici de causa concilium itidem
" annum faciebat uno mense longiorem, licet decimum et
" sextum diem mensis æquinoctium antecederet." Maimon.
de rat. intercal. p. 357. The intercalary month had 29 or 30
days, as the council pleased that appointed it.

† De rat. intercal. c. vi. p. 370.

" third,

" third, sixth, eighth, eleventh, fourteenth, seven-
" teenth, and nineteenth *."

2. Much the same remarks are made by Dr. Prideaux relative to the Hebrew mode of intercalating lunar years, when the use of those years was adopted.

" The Jews had their common years perfectly
" lunar, consisting of twelve lunar months; and so
" had the Greeks, only with this difference, that,
" whereas the Jews' lunar months were strictly
" lunar as being observed by the *phasis*, the Greeks,
" mistaking a lunar month to consist exactly of 30
" days, in compounding their year of 12 of them,
" made it amount to 360 days, which exceeded its
" true astronomical measure almost 6 days. But,
" besides the common years, they had also interca-
" lated years intermixed with the common years,
" which reduced all to the solar form; for, what
" was defective of it in the common years, was
" restored in the intercalated years. And this the
" Jews, as well as the Greeks, were necessitated to
" by their festivals: for the *Nisan* of the Jewish
" year, which began their ecclesiastical year, being
" pinned down by their *passover* (which was always
" celebrated in the middle of it) to the time of the
" beginning of their harvest; and the month of

* Jackson's Chronol. Antiq. Vol. ii. p. 15—23.

" *Tisri*,

" *Tisri*, which began their civil year, being likewise " pinned down by *the feast of tabernacles* (which " was always celebrated in the middle of that " month) to the time of the ending of their vintage; " this necessitated them to fling in an intercalary " month, whenever their year fell short of these " seasons. And the Greeks were likewise neces- " sitated to do the same thing for the sake of their " festivals, especially for the sake of their Olym- " piads. For, the fixed time for the celebration of " those games being the first full moon after the " summer solstice, it always fell within the compass " of one lunar month, either sooner or later, in the " solar year: and, there being just four years be- " tween Olympiad and Olympiad, these necessa- " rily made these years to be solar years; and cy- " cles and rules of intercalation were invented of " purpose to bring them to it: and the same is to " be said of all other nations which used the like " form. Although they might measure their months " by the motion of the moon, they always regulated " their years according to that of the sun—All " among them, that had lunar years, had also in- " tercalated years to make amends for their de- " fects: and therefore, whatsoever any of their " years might be in their *singular* numbers, they " were always solar in their *collective* sums *."

* Prideaux's Connection. part i. b. v. p. 292.

3. Sir

3. Sir Isaac Newton speaks to the same purpose. "The ancient year of the eastern nations consisted "of 12 months; and every month, of 30 days: "hence came the division of a circle into 360 de- "grees. This year seems to be used by Moses in "his history of the flood, and by John in the Apo- "calypse, where a time times and half a time, 42 "months, and 1260 days, are put equipollent. "But, in reckoning by *many* of these years together, "*an account is to be kept of the odd days which* "*were added to the end of these years.* For the "Egyptians added five days to the end of this year; "and so did the Chaldæans long before the time of "Daniel, as appears by the era of Nabonassar: "and the Persian magi used the same year of 365 "days, till the empire of the Arabians. The an- "cient Greeks also used the same solar year of 12 "equal months, or 360 days; but every other year "added an intercalary month, consisting of 10 and "11 days alternately *."

4. The same language is held by Dr. Blayney. "From the very nature of the Jewish establishment "it is abundantly evident, that, though they might "have reckoned a year or two together as consist- "ing of 12 lunar months, they never did nor could "have carried on the same kind of reckoning for

* Observ. on Dan. chap. x. p. 137, 138.

"any

" any long continued series of years in succession.
" A lunar year, consisting of 12 lunar months, or
" 354 days, falls short of the astronomical solar
" year, with which the seasons return, by about 11
" days. Consequently, with those who compute
" their time by such lunar years, the beginning of
" their year must make a very quick circuit through
" all the different seasons successively. But,
" among the Jews, the beginning of their year was,
" by the Mosaic constitutions, necessarily deter-
" mined to one particular season. The month
" *Abib* or *Nisan*, in which they came out of Egypt,
" was ordained to be unto them *the beginning of*
" *months, the first month of the year**. On the
" fourteenth day of this month the paschal lamb
" was to be killed†: the fifteenth was the first of
" the days of unleavened bread, and was to be kept
" as a sabbath or a day of holy rest, in which no
" servile work was to be done‡: and, on the mor-
" row after this sabbath (τῃ δευτερᾳ των αζυμων ἡμερᾳ,
" ἑκτη δ' ἐστιν και δεκατη, says Josephus §), they were
" directed to bring a sheaf of the first fruits for a
" wave-offering before the Lord, to be accepted for
" them. This was the beginning of their barley
" harvest, the day on which *they first put the sickle*

* Exod. xii. 2. † Ver. 6. ‡ Levit. xxiii. 6, 7.
§ Ant. Jud. l. iii. c. 10. § 5.

" *to*

" *to their corn;* nor were they at liberty to taste of " the fruits of their ground, *neither bread, nor* " *parched corn, nor green ears, until they had* " *brought this offering to their God**. From this " time they were required to number *seven complete* " *weeks*, and on the fiftieth day to offer a new meat- " offering unto the Lord of *the first fruits of their* " *wheat harvest* †. Also, on the fifteenth day of " the seventh month, they were commanded to ob- " serve *the feast of tabernacles*, otherwise called " *the feast of in-gathering, after that they had* " *gathered in their corn and their wine* ‡. Now " it is obvious, that these ordinances could have " been observed but seldom at their appointed " times, had the beginning of the Jewish year been " as variable with respect to the seasons, as a course " of lunar years would make it. For, in about six- " teen years, each season would be changed for its " opposite: autumn would be stept into the place " of spring; and the month *Abib*, instead of being " the month of green ears, as the name imports, " would fall in after all the fruits were already " housed in the barns. It is true, that, in order " to begin the year uniformly with the first day of

* Levit. xxiii. 10—14.

† Levit. xxiii. 15, &c. Exod. xxiv. 22.

‡ Compare Levit. xxiii. 39. Exod. xxiii. 16. Deut. xvi. 13.

" the

" the moon, the Jews gave the name of a year " sometimes to 12 lunar months, and that for two " years successively; in like manner as *we* for a " similar reason reckon three years together of " 365 days each, reserving the exceeding hours, as " they did the days, to be accounted for in an after " reckoning. Accordingly, the third year was sure " to be with them a kind of leap-year, by the in- " tercalation of an additional month, which they " called *Ve-Adar:* and thus, by repeated interca- " lations duly made, their reckoning in the long " run was brought to correspond pretty nearly with " solar computation, and the beginning of their " year to fall in much about the same season, and " at no great distance from the vernal equinox; " εν χριῳ τε ἡλιε καθεσ[illegible]ος, as Josephus * testi- " fies †."

5. Mr. Davies has also some ingenious remarks respecting the length of the ancient year, particularly of the Noëtic year, which he supposes to have been solar.

" The early ages in general must have been ac- " quainted with the solar period, which alone could " be of use in the computation of years. For,

* Ant. Jud. l. iii. c. 10. § 5.

† Blayney's Dissert. on the prophecy of the seventy weeks. p. 33, 34.

" while we deny them this knowledge, it is yet
" granted that they had the use of cycles, by which
" their defective years were adjusted to the course
" of nature. If they knew the sum of 19, 30, or
" 60 years, could they have been ignorant of the
" extent of one? That their years were so adjust-
" ed, is evident; for we find the same months con-
" stantly fall about the same season. Hesiod's
" description * can be applied only to the depth of
" winter, and therefore can have belonged only to
" years, which, taken together, amounted to solar
" years. The *Abib* of Moses, or month of *green*
" *corn*, as the name implies, must have constantly
" returned after the vernal equinox from the first
" time it received the name. And this name could
" not have been new. It was not Egyptian, but
" either Hebrew or Chaldaic: the Israelites had
" therefore brought it with them into Egypt. It
" had been known in the time of Abraham. For,
" on the 14th of this month, the children of Israel
" came out of Egypt; and, on the *self-same day*,
" 430 years before, their great ancestor Abraham
" had begun his peregrination. The length of the
" solar year then had been known from the days of
" Shem, who survived the commencement of Abra-
" ham's sojourning about 75 years. Had this year

* Μηνα δε λιγραιωνα, κ. τ. λ. Εργ. β. 322.

" been

" been unknown; had the *Epagomenæ* or even the " Bissextile been omitted, the month of green corn " must, during that period of 430 years, have some- " times fallen in the beginning and sometimes in " the depth of winter.

" The Egyptians claim the *Epagomenæ* and the " accurate computation of time, as inventions of " their own ancestors. This claim may be grant- " ed, if we take their own account of the inventor. " The first Thoth, amongst other things, calculated " the annual period. We learn from Manetho, the " celebrated Egyptian historian, who relates the " genuine traditions of his nation, that this Thoth " lived *before the flood.* For he left his discoveries " engraved upon certain columns, in *the sacred* " *dialect* and in *hieroglyphic letters;* and, *after* " *the deluge* (another) Thoth, the son of Agatho- " demon, *transcribed* these inscriptions into books, " and placed them in the sanctuaries of the Egyp- " tian temples *. What discoveries do the Egyp- " tians boast of, which were not originally derived " from the great Thoth? Those ancestors of the " Egyptians, who so eminently distinguished them- " selves, were then antediluvians, and consequently " the common parents of all other nations.

* Maneth. apud Euseb. Præp. Evan. lib. i. cap. 9.

" Thoth is said to have left 36,525 rolls of his " discoveries, by which the learned understand *pe-* " *riods of time* which he had calculated. I find by " Philo Judèus, that the ancient mystagogues re- " garded 100 as a perfect number; as the parts " which composed a *perfect whole*, or as the num- " ber of units which constituted a complete series. " If we regard 100 parts as equal to a complete " diurnal revolution, then 36,525 parts will amount " to 365 days and 6 hours: or, if 100 years con- " stitute a perfect age, agreeably to Philo's appli- " cation of the number in the case of Abraham, " then 36,525 will be the diurnal revolutions com- " prehended in that age. This I consider as a more " simple method of accounting for the number of " the Hermetic volumes, than by supposing a mul- " tiplication of cycles, which must imply *much* " *more* than a true calculation of the solar pe- " riod.

" The Egyptians had *years*, as they are styled " by the Greeks, of 6, 4, or 3, months. They may " have divided the annual *circle* into seasons, by " inscribing some of their geometrical figures, as " *the line* or *the triangle*, or else *the square* touch- " ing at the four cardinal points. Still the com- " plete circle remained the same. Is there nothing " in the Old Testament to confirm the antiquity of " this computation and the use of the *Epagomenæ*?

Job

" Job speaks* of days joined to the year, exclusive
" of the number of the months. The *Epagomenæ*
" appear then to have been known *out of Egypt*,
" about the time when Abraham settled in the land
" of Canaan, and during the life of the great patri-
" archs. Let us consider Noah's year. In the
" history of the deluge we have 5 successive months
" consisting altogether of 150 days, or 30 days
" each. I cannot conceive how such months could
" have been formed upon any lunar observation.
" From the first day of the tenth month we have
" an enumeration of 61 days, together with an un-
" specified period of time, before the commence-
" ment of the succeeding year. A complete year
" in Noah's days could not then have consisted of
" fewer than 12 such months or 360 days. But,
" if with the best copies of the LXX and with some
" other versions of credit we date the 61 days from
" the first of the *eleventh* month, this point must
" be regarded as fully determined. There will be
" 12 months and a few days over, during which
" Noah waited for the return of the third dove, and
" before he removed the covering of the ark on the
" *first* day of the *first* month of the new year.
" And there is the greatest probability in favour
" of this reading. Noah already *knew that the*

* Job iii, 6.

" *waters*

" *waters were abated from off the earth.* The
" question was now, whether the earth produced
" any thing, or whether the dove would be com-
" pelled by hunger to return to the ark. It is not
" to be supposed, that, after having for some time
" dispatched his weekly messengers, the patriarch
" should now wait 29 days to make this experi-
" ment; 3 or 4 days must have been fully suffi-
" cient for the purpose. Would not these circum-
" stances have pointed out some error in the text,
" had no ancient version suggested and authorized
" its correction? Upon this authority we have 12
" months of 30 days each, and the *Epagomenæ;*
" or in all 365 days. But how are we to account
" for the number and the precise length of the
" months? Perhaps something in the following
" manner. The first periodical phenomenon, which
" attracted the notice of our first parents, was pro-
" bably the re-appearance of the moon after the
" change. The iteration of the seasons, and the
" periodical approach and retreat of the sun with
" which the seasons were obviously connected,
" must have also presented themselves to observa-
" tion. It could not but be desireable and useful
" to ascertain the period of these changes. The
" moon was resorted to, as the first means of com-
" putation; and 12 lunations were found to come
" round nearer to the same point, than any other
" number

" number: hence the 12 months. But these were
" very soon discovered to be too short. The object
" in view was to obtain a knowledge of the return
" of the sun and the seasons. His course was then
" divided into 12 portions or signs, corresponding
" with the number of moons in the first computa-
" tion. Each of these portions was found to con-
" sist of 30 days and a fraction: but, as it would
" be inconvenient to divide a day, the whole num-
" ber was retained, and the surplus added to com-
" plete the year.

" The first idea of a year must have been that of
" the return of the sun and the seasons to the same
" point. And, from the visible revolution of the
" sun, men must have first obtained months and
" years thus constructed. Hence the Hebrew term
" for a year שנה implies *an iteration, repetition,*
" *a return to the same point.* This could have
" been no other than the return of the sun and the
" seasons. The sun was the great luminary, which,
" by his regular course amongst the other lights or
" stars, was appointed to measure years *.

" If the moon was first resorted to for the pur-
" pose of measuring the sun's course, it was soon
" found inadequate to the purpose. Its revolution
" had no connection with the return of the seasons.

* Gen. i. 14, 16.

" It

" It only served to suggest a division of the sun's
" course into 12 portions. In most nations, of
" which any ancient records and traditions are pre-
" served, we find, that this division of the year and
" the signs of the zodiac by which it was marked
" were known from remote ages. The discovery
" is claimed by several different nations, a circum-
" stance which generally attends those inventions
" which were derived from the common parents of
" the nations. The history of the deluge is under-
" stood to be recorded in the names and delinea-
" tions of some of the constellations. It is not
" improbable, that the Noachidæ assigned to them
" new names and representations, in order to com-
" memorate this awful event in the volume of the
" heavens, which would be open to their posterity
" in every region of the earth. But with no post-
" diluvian nation can astronomical studies have ori-
" ginated. Astronomical observations had been
" preserved at Babylon for somewhat more than 19
" centuries before the conquest of that city by Alex-
" ander. They had therefore commenced from the
" very time, when, agreeably to our chronology, the
" sons of men first began to dwell in the land of
" Shinar.

" Before their removal into that country, they
" could have had no observations calculated for
" the latitude of Babylon; and their date from this

" very

" very era absolutely proves that the science was
" not the discovery of the inhabitants, but that they
" brought it with them from their former residence
" amongst the mountains of Ararat, where the ante-
" diluvian astronomy had already been adjusted to
" the circumstances of time and place. An inves-
" tigation and discovery of the principles of the
" science must necessarily have preceded a series
" of just observations.

" The antiquity of this study may be inferred
" from the book of Job, where several stars and
" constellations are mentioned, in connection with
" observations upon the seasons, and as parts of the
" works of God which had been pointed out by
" the search of the great fathers of the human
" race.

" The Mosaical years from the creation cannot,
" one with another, have fallen much short of solar
" revolutions, which were evidently the measure of
" calculation in the time of Noah: for the age of
" this patriarch rather exceeds an average of the
" ages of his progenitors.

" From their common ancestors then the several
" nations may have derived the rudiments of astro-
" nomy and a pretty exact knowledge of the annual
" period. Different societies may, for the regula-
" tion of festivals and for various purposes, have
" employed lunar calculations, and reckoned by

" the

" the age of a moon which appeared after a certain " equinox or solstice, or after the rising of a certain " star; but such calculations were adjusted by cy- " cles so as not materially to affect the truth of " chronology. If we find a people acquainted only " with lunar months or only with years of 360 " days, that people must have fallen, at some pe- " riod, into a state of rudeness far below the stand- " ard of the primitive ages *."

IV. From what has been said, we may, I think, conclude, that the Jews before and after the time of Moses used the Chaldèan year of 12 equal months of 30 days each with 5 supernumerary days added to the end of it, and that they continued this aboriginal practice most probably until they fell under the dominion of the Greek princes. Such an usage will account for the silence of Scripture relative to intercalation; and would, at the same time, preserve the great feasts fixed to the spring and the autumn, by occasionally inserting, as *we* are wont to do, an additional leap-day. After the power of the Greeks became paramount in Asia, they seem to have adopted from them the lunar year. This necessarily introduced the inconvenient system of monthly intercalation, and thus accounts for the ap-

* Celtic Researches. p. 23—29.

pearance

pearance of the Rabbinical *Ve-Adar*, which is unknown in Scripture *.

1. But, as I have before observed, whatever might be the length of a *particular* year among the more ancient Jews, this at least is *absolutely certain:* since the months *Abib* and *Tisri* were fixed by the Levitical ordinances to the spring and the autumn, they plainly could not have circulated through the year (as Mr. Marshall's hypothesis necessarily requires): but, if the Jews had used lunar months of *any* description *without* either the addition of supernumerary days or an intercalation of some kind, the months *Abib* and *Tisri* must have circulated: we know however, that they did *not* circulate:

* The idea of Petavius is similar to this, though he thinks it probable that the Israelites paid some attention to the course of the moon even before the time of the Seleucidæ. Selden justly observes, that the Jewish year, when regulated by the *Ve-Adar*, was neither lunar nor solar; but that it perpetually fluctuated in length, in consequence of the attempts to adjust the course of the moon to that of the sun: and he mentions a Hebrew tradition, that the children of Issachar were particularly skilful in such computations, insomuch that they were figuratively said to have ascended up to the firmament and to have brought it down with them for the use of man. But both these authors agree, that the length of any number of Jewish years was virtually equal to the length of the same number of solar years. See Petav. Rationar. Temp. par. ii. l. i. c. 6. and Selden. de anno civili vet. Jud. passim, but especially c. 1.

therefore

therefore the Jewish years must, either by the yearly addition of supernumerary days or an occasional intercalation of a month, that is to say either *singly* or *collectively*, have been equal to solar years *.

2. If this be proved, we must unavoidably conclude, that the years of *the seventy weeks* are either solar years, or collectively equal to solar years. Which of the two they are, is perfectly immaterial in a discussion of the prophecy, for the sum total will in each case be the same: but, when we consider that the more ancient Jews seem to have used the Egyptian year (as may be inferred from the si-

* Mr. Marshall does not pretend to deny, that in the days of Daniel the year of 365 days was used, and likewise that the theory of intercalation was known: but he wishes to confine the use of such a year to *the learned*, and maintains that the only year then COMMONLY known in any part of the world was the year of 360 days uncorrected by any intercalations whatever (Treatise on the seventy weeks. p. 233.). The erroneousness of this opinion is sufficiently shewn by what has been said respecting the great festivals of the Jews. They were certainly observed IN COMMON by the *whole* nation, not by *the learned* of it only. But they plainly could *not* have been observed at their appointed seasons of the natural year, spring and autumn, and at the same time in the first and seventh months of the Jewish calendar year, by an unintercalated series of such years as Mr. Marshall would persuade us were *alone* known to the common people. Therefore in Daniel's time another mode of reckoning *must* have been in COMMON use, as well as known to *the learned*.

lence

lence of Scripture with respect to intercalation), and when we further consider that this year was undoubtedly used at Babylon when Daniel wrote (as appears from the chronology of the era of Nabonassar), we have every reason to conclude that the years of *the seventy weeks* are solar years. Nor is this all: by a parity of argument we must likewise conclude, that *the* 1260 *years* and the years of every numerical prophecy are either *individually* solar years, or *collectively* solar years.

3. The importance of the preceding discussion in an inquiry like the present is manifest. If the years of *the seventy weeks* are to be estimated as equivalent to solar years, which I think has been proved with as much evidence as matters of this nature are capable of, *no interpretation of the prophecy, which is founded on the system of lunar or abbreviated years of either description, can be deemed admissible.*

CHAPTER

CHAPTER II.

Concerning the chronology of the decrees enacted by the kings of Persia for the rebuilding of the temple and city of Jerusalem and for the restoration of the civil and ecclesiastical polity of Judah.

THE next point to be considered is the chronology of the different decrees enacted by the kings of Persia for the rebuilding of the city and temple of Jerusalem and for the restoration of the civil and ecclesiastical polity of Judah; because from one of these we are directed to compute *the seventy weeks.*

I. It has generally been said, that *four* decrees for these several purposes were enacted: the first, by Cyrus in the first year of his reign*; the second, by Darius about the third or fourth year of his reign†; the third, by Artaxerxes in the seventh year of

* Ezra i. 1—4.

† Ezra vi. 1—12. Ezra does not positively say in what year of Darius this decree was enacted: he only tells us, that the

of his reign*; and the fourth, by the same Artaxerxes in the twentieth year of his reign†. I am unable however to discover more than *three*. Cyrus, Darius, and Artaxerxes in the seventh year of his reign, are expressly said each *to have enacted a decree*‡; and their several decrees are *formerly recited* in the regular shape of *legal instruments:* but no mention is made of *any decree having been enacted* by Artaxerxes in the twentieth year of his reign. The whole that appears to have *then* passed betweeen the king and Nehemiah was this—Nehemiah, grieved to find the business of rebuilding the city proceed so slowly, notwithstanding the edicts of Cyrus and Darius, requests permission of the king to go to Jerusalem, in order that he may superintend and expedite the work. The king in-

the work of the house of God ceased unto the second year of his reign (Ezra iv. 24.). The Jews then resuming the work, Tatnai, Shethar-Boznai, and the Apharsachites, wrote to the king to learn whether any edict of Cyrus gave them authority to do so. Darius, having ascertained the existence of such a decree, confirmed it by a new one of his own. It may however be collected from Haggai i. 1, 15. ii. 1, 10. and Zechar. i. 1, 7. vii. 1. viii. 2, 3, that the edict of Darius was enacted in the third year of his reign, and brought to Jerusalem at the beginning of the fourth year. See Prideaux's Connect. Part i. b. iii. p. 187—191.

* Ezra vii. 11—26. † Nehem. ii. 1—9.

‡ Ezra i. 1. v. 13, 17—Ezra vi. 1—Ezra vii. 13, 21.

quires

quires how long he wishes to be absent. Nehemiah fixes the time. The king gives his consent. Nehemiah desires to have passports to the governors beyond the river, and an order upon Asaph the keeper of the royal forests for the requisite quantity of timber. The king assents to all his wishes; and Nehemiah forthwith proceeds to Jerusalem—Throughout the whole of this transaction no mention is made of any *new* decree being enacted; the king seems merely to grant permission to Nehemiah to put the *former* edicts more effectually in force, nor does Nehemiah request any thing else of the Persian sovereign. But let the history speak for itself.

" And it came to pass in the month Nisan, in " the twentieth year of Artaxerxes the king, that " wine was before him: and I took up the wine, " and gave it unto the king. Now I had not been " before time sad in his presence. Wherefore the " king said unto me, Why is thy countenance sad, " seeing thou art not sick? This is nothing else " but sorrow of heart. Then I was very sore " afraid, and said unto the king, Let the king live " for ever: why should not my countenance be " sad, when the city the place of my fathers' sepul- " chres lieth waste, and the gates thereof are con- " sumed with fire? Then the king said unto me, " For what dost thou make request? So I prayed

" to

" to the God of heaven. And I said unto the king,
" If it please the king, and if thy servant have
" found favour in thy sight, that thou wouldest send
" me unto Judah, unto the city of my fathers' se-
" pulchres, that I may build it. And the king said
" unto me, the queen also setting by him, For how
" long shall thy journey be? and when wilt thou
" return? So it pleased the king to send me, and
" I set him a time. Moreover, I said unto the
" king, If it please the king, let letters be given me
" to the governors beyond the river, that they may
" convey me over till I come into Judah; and a
" letter unto Asaph the keeper of the king's forest,
" that he may give me timber to make beams for
" the gates of the palace which appertained to the
" house, and for the wall of the city, and for the
" house that I shall enter into. And the king
" granted me, according to the good hand of my
" God upon me. Then I came to the governors
" beyond the river, and gave them the king's
" letters *."

In all this account I can perceive nothing like the enacting of any *decree;* nor is there the least hint given elsewhere that a decree *was* then enacted: it is merely said, what exactly quadrates with the account itself, that Nehemiah was appointed

* Nehem. ii. 1—9.

governor of Judah in the twentieth year of the king, and that he continued in office until his thirty second year*, when he returned to Artaxerxes to Babylon†. Hence I cannot refrain from thinking, that the bare *commission* granted by the king to Nehemiah has very improperly been esteemed a fourth *edict;* and consequently that we are scarcely warranted, by the terms of the prophecy, in computing *the seventy weeks* from the twentieth year of Artaxerxes. If then there be any weight in what has been here advanced, no more than *three* decrees in favour of the Jews were enacted by the kings of Persia, from one or other of which the period in question must be reckoned. I proceed to consider their chronology.

II. Respecting the date of the first decree there is not much dispute‡, for chronologers agree in placing the first year of Cyrus in the year 4178 of the Julian period and in the year 536 before the Christian era.

* Nehem. v. 14. † Nehem. xiii. 6.

‡ I may almost venture to say *no dispute* with respect to the *year*. Mr. Lancaster does indeed throw back the scriptural first year of Cyrus two years, and makes it *coincide* with the scriptural first year of Darius the Mede, instead of being *successive* to it: but for this opinion he has not much warrant. It will be discussed hereafter. The *year itself* is sufficiently determined; but *the precise time* of the year is not positively declared in Scripture.

III. But,

III. But, respecting the second decree, there is a question whether it was enacted by Darius Hystaspis, or Darius Nothus; that is to say, whether it was enacted in the year 4195 of the Julian period and in the year 519 before the Christian era, or in the year 4293 of the Julian period and in the year 421 before the Christian era. The latter opinion is maintained by Scaliger and Mede*. Its untenableness will be manifest from the following considerations.

1. According to profane history, there were *three* sovereigns of the Medo-Persian empire before Darius Hystaspis; namely Cyrus, Cambyses, and Smerdis the Magian impostor: and, according to Ezra, there were likewise *three* sovereigns of the Medo-Persian empire before that Darius who enacted a decree in favour of the Jews; namely Cyrus, Ahasuerus, and Artaxerxes†. It appears therefore from profane history, that a prince called *Darius* was the *fourth* Medo-Persian sovereign: and it also appears from Ezra, that a prince called *Darius* was the *fourth* Medo-Persian sovereign. Hence there is the very strongest presumption, that these two princes, *each* described as the *fourth*

* Scalig. de Emend. temp. l. vi.—Mede's Treatise on Daniel's Weeks. Works. p. 697.

† Ezra i. 1—iv. 1—iv. 7, 11, 24.

Medo-Persian sovereign and *each* denominated *Darius*, are one and the same person; and consequently that the *Darius Hystaspis* of profane history is that Darius, who, according to Ezra, enacted a decree in favour of the Jews.

2. Nor is this the only reason. Joshua the high-priest, and Zerubbabel the governor, were the persons who were sent to Jerusalem with the original decree of Cyrus*: and they were likewise the persons who carried into execution the edict of Darius†. But, between the first year of Cyrus and the third year of Darius Nothus, there is a period of 115 years. Now, when the decree of Cyrus was enacted, Joshua must have been at the least 40 years of age, because he had sons engaged in the work of the temple, the *youngest* of whom was upwards of 20 years old‡: and we cannot suppose Zerubbabel to have been much younger, because an inexperienced boy would scarcely have been appointed governor. Such being the case, if we adopt the opinion of Scaliger and Mede, that the *Darius* who enacted the decree was *Darius Nothus*, we shall make Joshua and Zerubbabel at the era of the second decree to have been, upon the most mo-

* Ezra ii. 2. iii. 8.

† Ezra v. 2, 5, 6. vi. 1—Haggai i. 1—Zechar. i. 1. iii. 1. iv. 6, 7, 9.

‡ Ezra iii. 8, 9.

derate

derate calculation, little less than 160 years of age.

This chronological objection Scaliger attempts to remove by urging, that there have been instances, even in our own days, of equal longevity—Instances, it is true, of remarkable longevity *have* occurred; but they have been *solitary* instances: whereas, if *Darius Nothus* be the *Darius* in question, there must have been, at the time when his edict was put into execution, not a *single individual* merely, but *several* persons even of a yet *greater* age than the supposed age of Joshua and Zerubbabel. In the second year of the *Darius* who enacted the decree, Haggai is directed by the Lord to inquire of the assembled residue of the people, "Who is left among you that saw this house in its "first glory? and how do ye see it now? Is it "not in your eyes in comparison of it as nothing*?" Now the first house was destroyed by Nebuchadnezzar in the year A. C. 588, and the second year of Darius Nothus synchronizes with the year A. C. 422: consequently, between the destruction of the first temple and the second year of Darius Nothus, there is a period of 166 years. But the very earliest that we can suppose a person to be a competent judge of the comparative magnificence of two

* Haggai ii. 3.

buildings

buildings is the age of 10 years: and even this supposition, which is plainly far too low a one, would make every person, who had viewed with the eye of observation the first temple, no less than 176 years old in the second year of Darius Nothus. Granting then the possibility that Joshua and Zerubbabel might have attained to the advanced age which the hypothesis of Scaliger and Mede requires, it is surely incredible that there should be *many* among the residue of the people nearly 180 years old, to whom Haggai could appeal respecting the comparative magnificence of the two temples. But this we shall be obliged to suppose, if we adopt the scheme of Scaliger and Mede and attribute the enacting of the second decree to Darius Nothus instead of Darius Hystaspis.

Scaliger does indeed attempt to obviate this difficulty also, by explaining the words in Haggai interjectionally, *Oh! if any of you had seen the glory of the first house!* whence it would appear, that, so far from there being *many* who had seen the first house, there were *none* then alive—But the original will not bear such a translation. The literal version of it is, *Who amongst you is left, that hath seen this house in its first glory? And what do ye see it now? Is it not in comparison of that as nothing in your eyes?* Here an appeal is plainly made to persons who had seen *both* houses; otherwise

wise it would have been impossible for them to make that comparison between the two which they are called upon to make.

3. There is yet another argument of a numerical nature with which we are furnished by Zechariah. He tells us, that in the *second* year of the *Darius*, who was contemporary with himself and Joshua and Zerubbabel, and who consequently was the person that enacted the decree, God had had indignation against Jerusalem and the cities of Judah 70 *years* *. He moreover tells us, that in the *fourth* year of this same Darius the people had observed the fasts of the fifth and seventh months 70 *years* †. Now it is known, that the fast of the fifth month was instituted on account of the final destruction of the city and temple by Nebuchadnezzar in the fifth Jewish month of the year A. C. 588; and the fast of the seventh month, on account of the murder of Gedaliah and the utter desolation of the land in the seventh month of the same year. It is likewise known, that the final siege of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar, which terminated with the destruction of the city and temple, commenced in the year A. C. 590. If then we compute 70 years from the year A. C. 590, we shall be brought to the year

* Zech. i. 12. Compare Zechar. i. 1. iii. 1. iv. 6. Ezra v. 1, 2, 5. vi. 1.

† Zech. vii. 1, 3, 5.

A. C.

A. C. 520, which synchronizes with the second year of Darius Hystaspis: and, if we compute 70 years also from the year A. C. 588, we shall be brought to the year A. C. 518, which synchronizes with the fourth year of Darius Hystaspis*. These two periods therefore of 70 years each are plainly the two periods spoken of by Zechariah as terminating in the *second* and *fourth* years of a prince named *Darius:* because they commence, the one with the siege of Jerusalem, and the other with the destruction of the temple and the complete desolation of the land, on account of which it is known that the two fasts were instituted. And, since they terminate in the second and fourth years of *Darius Hystaspis*, that *Darius* must necessarily be the *Darius* spoken of by Zechariah, and consequently the *Darius* who enacted the decree—As the exact correspondence of the two periods with the second and fourth years of Darius Hystaspis proves that that prince must be the *Darius* in question, so their complete want of correspondence with the second and fourth years of Darius Nothus no less effectually proves that he cannot be the *Darius* of Zechariah. From the commencement of the last siege of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar in the year A. C. 590 to the second year of Darius Nothus, which

* See the chronological tables in the Appendix.

synchronizes

synchronizes with the year A. C. 422, there are 168 years; and, from the destruction of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar in the year A. C. 588 to the fourth year of Darius Nothus, which synchronizes with the year A. C. 420, there are likewise 168 years: whereas, had he been the *Darius* mentioned by Zechariah, there ought in both cases to have been no more than 70 years. Hence it is plain, that the *Darius* who enacted the second decree must have been Darius Hystaspis, and not Darius Nothus.

Of this second chronological objection to his hypothesis Scaliger is aware. He attempts therefore to get rid of it (in part at least) by asserting, that the fasts in the fifth and seventh months must have been formally appointed by an act of the Jewish church: but that there could be no convention of that church until after the restoration from Babylon: therefore that the 70 years, during which the fasts had been kept in the fourth year of Zechariah's *Darius*, must not be computed from *the actual occurrence* of the events which they commemorated —This is plainly a mere attempt to elude the difficulty. There is no reason to suppose, that the ecclesiastical polity of the Jews was so entirely dissolved during the Babylonian captivity, that fasts could not be immediately appointed in remembrance of the calamities then fresh in their minds. Indeed the very circumstance of their appointment is detailed

tailed in the first chapter of the apocryphal book of Baruch: and, although this book be not canonical, the writer of it, whoever he was, must, to keep up the probability of his narrative, have ascribed to the fasts that origin which was generally believed among the Jews. It may be added, that the observance of such an ordinance seems to be hinted at in the 137th Psalm, which might perhaps have been composed for the occasion. But, even supposing that there could be no formal meeting of the Jewish church during the captivity, surely it is more likely that the leading men should solemnly recommend the observance of annual fasts from the time of the events commemorated by them, than that such fasts should not be appointed until many years afterwards. And, when to this abstract probability is added the actual circumstance that 70 years computed from the occurrence of the events expire precisely in the fourth year of a prince named *Darius*, the result seems to be little less than absolute certainty, that the fasts were observed from the occurrence of the events, and consequently that the *Darius* spoken of must have been Darius Hystaspis. To suppose otherwise is in fact to suppose, that the fasts were not instituted until 98 years after the occurrence of the events which they commemorated, and until 46 years after the restoration of the Jews in the first year of Cyrus; during any one of which 46 years they

they might, even according to Scaliger himself, have been regularly appointed by a convention of the church—But, if Scaliger had been more successful than he has been in repelling the present objection, another would still remain behind. In the second year of this same Darius, whoever he was, God is said to have had indignation against Jerusalem 70 *years*. Now, if this Darius be Darius Hystaspis, we immediately perceive *the reason* of the declaration; for *exactly* 70 *years before his second year the final siege of Jerusalem commenced.* But, if he be Darius Nothus, it will be impossible to discover *why* God should be said to have had indignation against Jerusalem 70 years, *neither more nor less*, reckoned backward from *his* second year.

4. The point may be still further proved by a fourth argument. Ezra, subsequent to his detailing the history of the decree enacted by Darius, tells us, that "*after* these things" he was sent to Jerusalem to execute a *new* decree enacted in the seventh year of Artaxerxes*. Let Darius then be who he may, this Artaxerxes must plainly be his *successor*, because *his* decree was enacted *after* the decree of Darius. If therefore *Darius Nothus* be the *Darius* intended by Ezra, the *Artaxerxes* whom he mentions, being a *successor* of this *Darius*, must

* Ezra vii. 1, 8.

have

have been *Artaxerxes Mnemon* *. Such a supposition however is utterly irreconcileable with chronology, as will sufficiently appear from the following statement.

Whoever the *Artaxerxes* may be that is mentioned by Ezra as enacting the third decree, he must be that *Artaxerxes* who was contemporary with Eliashib the high-priest of the Jews, because Eliashib was high-priest when Nehemiah came to Jerusalem in the twentieth year of this same *Artaxerxes* †. Now, according to the number of years which the Chronicon Alexandrinum ascribes to each high-priest, Eliashib *could not* have been contemporary with *Artaxerxes Mnemon*, but *must* have been contemporary with *Artaxerxes Longimanus*. The high-priesthood of Joshua commenced with the first year of Cyrus and the year 4178 of the Julian period, and lasted 53 years: that of his son Joiakim lasted 30 years: and that of his grandson Eliashib, the high-priest in question, 40 years. Hence it is

* Darius Nothus had two successors of the name of *Artaxerxes*, *Artaxerxes Mnemon*, and *Artaxerxes Ochus*. The latter of these however could not be the *Artaxerxes* of Ezra and Nehemiah, because mention is made of the 32d year of their *Artaxerxes* (Nehem. xiii. 6.), whereas *Ochus* reigned no more than 21 years. Consequently, if the *Darius* of Ezra be *Darius Nothus*, his *Artaxerxes* must be *Artaxerxes Mnemon*.

† Nehem. ii. 1. iii. 1.

evident,

evident, that Joiakim must have died 82 years after the first year of *Cyrus:* that is to say, he must have died in the year 4260 of the Julian period, which coincides with the eleventh year of *Artaxerxes Longimanus.* At this time therefore Eliashib must have succeeded him. Consequently, the *Artaxerxes*, with whom Eliashib was contemporary, must have been *Artaxerxes Longimanus.* It is also evident, that Eliashib must have died 122 years after the first year of *Cyrus:* that is to say, he must have died in the year 4300 of the Julian period, which coincides with the tenth year of *Darius Nothus.* But *Darius Nothus* was the *predecessor* of *Artaxerxes Mnemon.* Therefore the *Artaxerxes*, with whom Eliashib was contemporary, could not have been *Artaxerxes Mnemon;* inasmuch as Eliashib died in the tenth year of *Darius Nothus*, before *Artaxerxes Mnemon* came to the throne *.

Thus

* See the chronological tables in the Appendix. The Chronicon Alexandrinum is followed by Dr. Prideaux as the safest guide in ascertaining the lengths of the high-priesthoods after the Babylonian captivity. That Eliashib was the son of Joiakim, and Joiakim the son of Joshua, appears from Nehem. xii. 10. Independent indeed of the Chronicon Alexandrinum, the error of Scaliger is manifest from this consideration. If Eliashib was high-priest in the 20th year of *Artaxerxes Mnemon*, which he must have been if the *Darius* who enacted the decree was *Darius Nothus*, the three successive high-priesthoods of a father,

Thus it appears, that the *Artaxerxes*, with whom Eliashib was contemporary, must have been *Artaxerxes Longimanus*. But the contemporary of Eliashib was the *Artaxerxes* who enacted the third decree. Therefore the *Artaxerxes* who enacted the third decree, must have been *Artaxerxes Longimanus*. This being the case, since the decree of *Darius* was enacted *previous* to the decree of *Artaxerxes Longimanus*, the *Darius* who enacted it must have been a *predecessor* of that sovereign. Therefore he could not be *Darius Nothus*, who was the *successor* of *Artaxerxes Longimanus*. But, if he were not *Darius Nothus*, he must have been *Darius Hystaspis;* because there was no other *Darius* between *Cyrus* and *Artaxerxes Longimanus*.

The general result then of the whole is, that, since Ezra's *Darius* is *Darius Hystaspis*, and since the decree in favour of the Jews was enacted in the third year of this *Darius*, it must have been enacted in the Julian year 4195, and in the year 519 before the Christian era.

IV. Respecting the propriety of the chronological arrangement here maintained, Petavius, Usher,

father, a son, and a grandson, must jointly have extended to the incredible length of more than a century and a half. For the first year of Joshua coincides with the first year of Cyrus, or the Julian year 4178; and the 20th year of Artaxerxes Mnemon coincides with the Julian year 4329.

and Prideaux, are all agreed in opposition to Scaliger: but there has been a difference of opinion in settling the true epoch of the first year, and consequently of the seventh and twentieth years, of Artaxerxes Longimanus, who was contemporary with Ezra and Nehemiah. That his father Xerxes began to reign in the year 4229 of the Julian period, and in the year A. C. 485, and that his own reign *expired* in the year 4289 or 4290 of the Julian period, and in the year A. C. 425 or 424, according as the nine months during which his son Xerxes and Sogdianus reigned after him are excluded or included *, is universally acknowledged †: the only question is, when the reign of Artaxerxes is to be considered as *beginning*. Petavius and Usher make his first year commence in the year 4240 of the Julian period, and in the year A. C. 474, but with this difference: Usher makes it commence so far on in the year, that the *Nisan* of his first year falls out in the Julian year 4241, and in the year A. C. 473;

* In estimating the length of the reigns of Xerxes and Artaxerxes, the year of the Julian period 4229 and the year 4289 or 4290 are to be reckoned inclusive, to make up the sum total of their reigns 61 years or 62 years, according as the reign of Artaxerxes is reputed to extend to the year 4289 or to the year 4290.

† Mr. Lancaster indeed objects; but, with how little reason, will be shewn hereafter.

whereas,

whereas, according to Petavius, it falls out in the preceding year. This difference, of course, runs through the whole of his reign: consequently the *Nisan* in his twentieth year, from which they alike compute *the seventy weeks*, is the *Nisan* in the Julian year 4259 and in the year A.C. 455, according to Petavius; whereas, according to Usher, it is the *Nisan* in the Julian year 4260 and in the year A.C. 454*. But Dr. Prideaux, adhering to the canon of Ptolemy, makes his first year coincide with the Julian year 4250 and the year A.C. 464, so that the *Nisan* of that year falls out in the first year of his reign: consequently, according to this reckoning, the *Nisan* in his twentieth year will be the *Nisan* of the Julian year 4269 and of the year A.C. 445; and the *Nisan* in his seventh year will be the *Nisan* of the Julian year 4256 and of the year A.C. 458. In short, the two first of these computations

* Petav. Rationar. Temp. par. ii. lib. iii. c. 10. p. 123—125 —Usser. Annal. in A. P. J. 4240, 4259, 4260. Dr. Prideaux is right in saying, that both Petavius and Usher compute *the seventy weeks* from the *Nisan* in the twentieth year of Artaxerxes: but, as far as I can understand those two chronologers, he is mistaken in asserting, that they *equally* reckon from the Julian year 4260, and of course from the *Nisan* in that year. *Usher* does indeed compute from the *Nisan* of that year; but *Petavius* computes from the *Nisan* of the preceding year: consequently they differ a year in the era of our Lord's crucifixion. See Prideaux's Connect. part i. b. v. p. 294, 295.

place

place the seventh year and the twentieth year of Artaxerxes each from nine to ten years further back than the third does.

1. Though Petavius agrees with Usher in reckoning *the seventy weeks* from the *Nisan* of the twentieth year of Artaxerxes, and though he *nearly* agrees with him in his chronological arrangement of the first year of that prince, they do not adopt such an arrangement precisely on the same grounds. Petavius places the death of Xerxes in the same year with Dr. Prideaux; but supposes, that about ten years previous to his death he admitted Artaxerxes into a share of the government, and that from this admission all the years of the latter prince's reign (and therefore among them his twentieth year) are to be computed. He builds his hypothesis chiefly upon the authority of Thucydides; who tells us, that Themistocles, when he fled into Persia, addressed himself to Artaxerxes, *then in the beginning of his reign* *. But we are informed by Diodorus Siculus, that Themistocles fled into Persia in the second year of the 77th Olympiad, *several years before the death of Xerxes* †. Petavius therefore, in

* Νεωστὶ βασιλευοντα.

† Diodorus asserts, that Xerxes reigned 21 years, herein agreeing with the canon of Ptolemy; but he likewise asserts, that Themistocles fled into Persia in the second year of the

in order to reconcile these two authors, conjectures, that Artaxerxes must have been admitted into a share of the government several years *before* the death of his father: and the number of these years he determines to be *ten;* which arrangement enables him to reckon *the seventy weeks* from the twentieth year of Artaxerxes, supposing that year to be computed from his admission into a copartnership of the empire. The conjecture itself he grounds on the practice of the Persian kings to name their successors previous to their taking the field in any war of importance: and the particular war, previous to which Artaxerxes was so named, he supposes to be that against the Greeks, which Xerxes renewed after the death of Pausanias.

Against this hypothesis more than one objection may be urged—1. There is nothing in history to warrant the conjecture which is necessary to it. Herodotus does indeed tell us, that, when a disputed succession was apprehended, the king of Persia was wont to name his successor: but *the mere naming of a successor* is a very different thing from *the associating of a colleague into a copartnership of empire.* From the *latter* the years of a prince *might* be reckoned; from the *former* it is

77th Olympiad: therefore he necessarily brings him to the Persian court several years *before* the death of Xerxes.

impossible

impossible that they should*—2. The *seventh* year of this same Artaxerxes is mentioned by Ezra, the immediate predecessor of Nehemiah who mentions his *twentieth* year: therefore, if the one year be computed from his supposed nomination as successor, the other must be similarly computed: in which case, if he were so nominated ten years *before* the death of his father, his seventh year must plainly coincide with that preceding his father's antepenultimate year. But the language used by Ezra in his account of the decree enacted in the seventh year of Artaxerxes, decidedly proves him to have been then reigning *alone* †. Therefore, if the father were dead in the seventh year of the son, and if this seventh year were reckoned from the son's association into the government, the son could not have been so associated ten years *before* the death of the father—3. Thucydides, in the passage whence the

* Petavius wishes indeed to blend the two ideas together, as if *the nominated successor* must therefore be *a colleague in empire:* but Herodotus, to whom he refers, so far from corroborating his opinion, directly contradicts it. He tells us, that Xerxes was *nominated the successor* of Darius *before* the death of that prince, but that he did not *ascend the throne* until *after* it (See Herod. l. vii. c. 2, 3, 4, 5.). Yet, on the authority of this account, Petavius would make Artaxerxes to have been the *colleague* of Xerxes, and to have even borne the title of *king* in his father's life-time.

† See the whole of Ezra vii.

opinion of Petavius is deduced, evidently speaks of Artaxerxes as having recently come to the throne *after the death of his father*, not *during his life-time:* consequently, this arrangement both contradicts Thucydides, and fails of reconciling him with Diodorus, because according to the latter historian Themistocles came to the Persian court *during the life of Xerxes*—4. Artaxerxes, as we are informed by Justin and Diodorus, was only *a boy* at the death of his father, which (according to Petavius) occurred about seven years after his reception of Themistocles; for Thucydides asserts that he received him in the beginning of his reign, and Petavius makes his reign commence about three years before the reception of his Athenian guest. Hence, if he were only *a boy* when his father died, he must have been little more than *an infant* seven years *previous* to that event: consequently, he must at that time have been *incapable* of receiving any address from Themistocles *.

2. Abp.

* Abp. Usher objects to the account, which makes Artaxerxes *a boy* at the death of his father; because he is said by Justin to have stabbed Artabanus only seven months after that event, and because in his seventh year he is represented by Ezra (vii. 23.) as being the father of more than one son. These different circumstances the Primate thinks incongruous, as *a boy* would be unequal to the *personal* assassination of *a man*, and as this boy could scarcely have been the father of a family

2. Abp. Usher nearly agrees with Petavius in his arrangement of the twentieth year of Artaxerxes,

family in the *seventh* year after he was styled *a boy*. Annal. in A. P. J. 4241.

The incongruity does not appear to me to be such as will warrant our rejection of the testimony of Justin and Diodorus. Let us suppose Artaxerxes to have been twelve years of age at the time of his father's death. In that case, he was *a boy* when his father died, and might therefore with the strictest propriety have been so denominated in history. Yet, seven months afterwards, when he was nearly thirteen years old, I see no difficulty in conceiving, that he might have thrust Artabanus through with a sword in the manner that the story is told by Justin, namely *when Artabanus was unarmed and off his guard.* And, if we consider both the early puberty of the inhabitants of warm climates, and the prevailing practice of polygamy, I see as little difficulty in conceiving, that, in the seventh year after the death of his father, when he would have been eighteen years old, he might have been the parent by different wives even of *many* sons.

The objection however of Abp. Usher furnishes another argument against the hypothesis of Petavius. If Artaxerxes were only *a boy* at the death of his father, if he were admitted into a copartnership of the empire from nine to ten years *before* that death, and if his seventh and twentieth years are to be reckoned from his admission into a share of the government; it is evident, that in his seventh year he must have been from two to three years younger than he was when his father died. But he was *a boy* even when his father died. Therefore, two or three years *before* that event or *in* his supposed seventh year, he must have been a still *younger* boy: that is to say, according to the hypothesis of Petavius, he could not, in his seventh year,

erxes, but differs from him in his date of the death of Xerxes. Instead of making Artaxerxes reign about ten years conjointly with his father, he places the death of his father about nine years further back: and thus, agreeably to the general opinion, he makes Artaxerxes regularly succeed his father, and computes the years of his reign according to the years of his actual reign, reckoning from the death of Xerxes. In other words, he takes nine years from the reign of Xerxes, and adds them to that of Artaxerxes; extending the reign of Artaxerxes (within which the few months, during which his two successors reigned, are included) to 50 years, and reducing that of Xerxes to no more than 12 years. This hypothesis is adopted for the purpose of more satisfactorily reconciling Thucydides with Diodorus Siculus, who tells us that Themistocles fled into Persia so early as the second year of the 77th Olympiad.

It is objectionable on the following grounds—1. In shortening the reign of Xerxes to 12 years and in lengthening that of Artaxerxes to 50 years,

year, have been more than nine or ten years old. Yet this Artaxerxes, in the decree enacted in his seventh year, speaks of himself as *then*, namely *in his seventh year*, having *sons* (Ezra vii. 28.); that is to say, as having *sons* at the very time, when, if Petavius be followed, *his own* age could not have exceeded ten years.

it

it directly contradicts the astronomical canon of Ptolemy; which assigns 21 years to Xerxes, and 41 years to Artaxerxes including the short reigns of his two successors. It likewise contradicts the general testimony of history, which accords with the arrangement of Ptolemy*—2. It does *not* reconcile Thucydides with Diodorus Siculus, any more than the scheme of Petavius: for Thucydides represents Themistocles as applying to Artaxerxes *after* the death of his father and at the beginning of his reign, while Diodorus places his flight *before* the death of that prince's father, and fixes it to the second year of the 77th Olympiad. These two statements can never subsist together: *one*, or the *other*, of them *must* be erroneous †—3. If it be thought necessary

* Diodorus, Plutarch, Africanus, Eusebius, and others, all agree in stating, that Xerxes reigned 21 years, and Artaxerxes 41 years.

† At least this must be the case, if Diodorus Siculus means to say, that Themistocles fled *directly* to the court of Persia in the 2d year of the 77th Olympiad. Mr. Marshall attempts very ingeniously to reconcile the two historians, by supposing, that, although Themistocles might flee from *Athens* in the year mentioned by Diodorus and therefore *in* the life-time of Xerxes; yet, since (according to Cornelius Nepos) he fled to Argos in the *first* instance and lived there an indefinite space of time in great dignity, he might therefore not arrive at *the court of Persia* until the commencement of the reign of Artaxerxes *after* the death of his father, agreeably to the assertion of Thucydides. Marshall's Treatise on the seventy weeks. p. 178.

to adopt the statement of Thucydides rather than that of Diodorus, we are still no way obliged (as the Primate does) to impugn the astronomical canon of Ptolemy. Instead of placing the first year of Artaxerxes nine years *further back*, we may, with Mr. Dodwell*, adjust the matter in a way perfectly agreeable to the canon, by setting aside the date assigned by Diodorus to the flight of Themistocles, and by bringing that flight nine years *lower down*—4. But, however this may be, the Greek historians, so far as we can collect from Plutarch, seem to have had very uncertain information respecting the Persian sovereign to whom Themistocles addressed himself. Some tell us, that it was Xerxes; and others, his son Artaxerxes. The former opinion was held by Diodorus, Ephorus, Dinon, Clitarchus, Heraclides, and others: the latter, by Thucydides and Charon of Lampsacus†. Dr. Prideaux prefers the first‡: Mr. Dodwell and Abp. Usher, the second. Such being the case, I cannot think that the authority of any of them will warrant the Primate in setting aside, as he does in this instance, the canon of Ptolemy§. If we *must* bow to the authority

* In Annal. Thucyd. † Plut. in vit. Themist.

‡ Prideaux's Connect. part i. b. iv. p. 257, 258.

§ Mr. Marshall well observes, that "it is impossible for us "to know of a certainty how these things were. The ancients "themselves,

rity of Thucydides, we must surely bow no less to the authority of Ptolemy: and, if so, the authority of Diodorus must give place, and the flight of Themistocles must be brought nine years lower down; which is perhaps the best arrangement that can be adopted*. At any rate, the canon of Ptolemy cannot be given up. Though it may have been certainly known *in general* (as it appears to have been both from the canon and from history), that Xerxes reigned 21 years, and Artaxerxes 41; it is easy to conceive, that a Greek writer may have incautiously erred respecting the *minor* circumstance of the particular prince to whom Themistocles made application. But the canon of Ptolemy is built upon astronomical demonstrations, and no one has hitherto detected any error in his calculation of the eclipses by which his chronological eras are determined. It is moreover verified by its agreement every where

" themselves, as we have seen, were not agreed in the exact " time of them. Even in Plutarch's time, they were points " disputed. It is surely vain and trifling therefore from such " uncertain characters of time to go about to settle the chro- " nological points now before us; especially to think of esta- " blishing them from hence in opposition to Ptolemy's canon " the surest guide we have in chronology." Treatise on the seventy weeks. p. 179.

* " The opinion of Thucydides," says Plutarch, " seems " most agreeable to chronology, though that is not perfectly " well settled." Plut. in vit. Themist.

with

with Scripture. Hence it is the surest guide in chronology, and cannot be set aside for the authority of any other human writing whatsoever.

3. Thus we may, I think, conclude, that the date, which Dr. Prideaux has assigned to the first year of Artaxerxes is the true one; inasmuch as it accords both with the canon of Ptolemy, and with the general testimony that is borne to the respective lengths of the reigns of Xerxes and Artaxerxes *.

V. We may now therefore exhibit the following chronological table, shewing at one point of view the different dates of the several decrees, enacted by the kings of Persia, relative to the rebuilding of the city and temple of Jerusalem and the restoration of the Levitical Church under Ezra and Nehemiah.

* See Prideaux's Connect. part i. b. v. p. 280—297.

Years

A. Æ. N.	A. P. J.	A. A. C.	Years of the reigns of the kings of Persia, in which the several edicts were enacted.
212	4178	536	Edict of Cyrus in the first year of his reign. Ezra i. 1—4. Compare Chap. v. 13, 17. vi. 1—5.
229	4195	519	Edict of Darius Hystaspis in the third year of his reign. Ezra vi. 1—12. Compare Chap. iv. 24. v. Zechar. i. 1, 7. vii. 1. viii. 3.
290	4256	458	Edict of Artaxerxes Longimanus, promulged in the month *Nisan* in the seventh year of his reign. Ezra vii. 7, 8, 9, 11—26.
303	4269	445	Permission granted by Artaxerxes Longimanus in the month *Nisan*, in the twentieth year of his reign, to Nehemiah to go up to Jerusalem for the purpose of superintending and forwarding the rebuilding of the city. Nehem. ii. 1—9.

VI. The result of what has been said is this. As the former inquiry set aside all interpretations of the prophecy of *the seventy weeks*, which are founded upon the hypothesis of adopting abbreviated lunar months of either description: so the present sets aside all, that compute *the seventy weeks* from dates which disagree with those in the chronological table here exhibited. Indeed, if I

mistake

mistake not, it does more. For, since they are plainly to be computed from the enacting of a decree to rebuild Jerusalem in some sense or another*, if *no decree of any sort* were enacted in the twentieth year of Artaxerxes, but only *a verbal permission* granted to Nehemiah to enforce more effectually the edicts of Cyrus and Darius, as I have attempted to shew; then they cannot be computed from the twentieth year of Artaxerxes, whether that year be arranged agreeably to the chronology of Petavius and Usher, or to that of Ptolemy and Prideaux.

* Dan. ix. 25.

CHAPTER

CHAPTER III.

Concerning the various interpretations that have been given of the prophecy of the seventy weeks.

THESE necessary preliminary matters being settled, we shall now be better prepared to examine the merits of various interpretations that have been given of the prophecy of *the seventy weeks.*

I. Many commentators have adopted the plan of reckoning this period from the twentieth year of Artaxerxes Longimanus, in which Nehemiah was sent from Babylon to superintend the rebuilding of Jerusalem. They seem to have been induced to prefer it chiefly from an idea, that the language, in which that prince's commission is couched, corresponds more exactly with the language of the prophecy than the terms of the three preceding edicts.

1. The exposition offered by its original author Africanus, who flourished at the beginning of the third century, is briefly as follows. He first maintains, that the years, of which *the seventy weeks* are composed,

composed, ought to be estimated as abbreviated lunar years of 354 days each. He next asserts, that they are to be reckoned *unto the Messiah*, by which phrase he understands *unto the death of the Messiah*. He then counts 475 natural years from the twentieth year of Artaxerxes to the fifteenth year of Tiberius Cesar, in which he supposes Christ to have suffered. And these 475 years he states to be equal, within a mere trifle (as they undoubtedly are), to 490 years of 354 days each *.

This ancient interpretation abounds with palpable mistakes of various descriptions—1. Its very *principle* is itself erroneous, inasmuch as it is founded on a mode of computation, the propriety of which cannot be allowed. I have already shewn, that we have no right to conclude from the prophet's use of the verb נחתך, that he is here employing abbreviated lunar years instead of natural solar years: and I have moreover shewn, that, whatever might be the length of a *single* Jewish year (whether it was a solar year or a lunar year), the use of *unintercalated* lunar years in the interpretation of this prophecy is indefensible—2. Its *arrangement of the weeks* is likewise erroneous. I stop not at present to inquire how far it is possible for *unto the Messiah* to mean *unto the death of the Messiah:*

* African. apud Hieron. Comment. in Dan. in loc.

this

this point will be discussed hereafter. Let it however mean what it may, we are taught by the prophet to calculate *unto the Messiah* the period of *sixty-two weeks added to seven weeks*, that is to say *sixty-nine weeks:* the hypothesis in question calculates, not *sixty-nine weeks*, but *seventy weeks*—3. Its *chronology* is equally erroneous. According to the astronomical canon of Ptolemy, between the twentieth year of Artaxerxes Longimanus and the fifteenth year of Tiberius Cesar, there are only 473 years, not 475 years*: so that, if Christ had been *actually* crucified in the fifteenth year of the latter of these princes, the scheme would still have been defective. Much more therefore does it fail, when we find that Christ suffered death, not in the *fifteenth* year of Tiberius, but in his *nineteenth* year. Nor will the matter be at all improved if we reckon *the seventy weeks* unto the true time of the death of our Lord. Between Nehemiah's receiving his commission from Artaxerxes in the twentieth year of his reign and the crucifixion of Christ, there are

* From the number of years assigned to each reign in this canon, it appears, that the twentieth year of Artaxerxes coincides with A. Æ. N. 303 and A. P. J. 4269; and the fifteenth year of the sole reign of Tiberius, with A. Æ. N. 776 and A. P. J. 4742. See the chronological tables in the Appendix.

precisely 477 solar years *. But no calculation by lunar years of any description will reduce 490 years to the exact sum of 477 solar years. If we consider them as true lunar years of 354 days each, 490 such years will be equal to 474 solar years and about 231½ days, which falls more than two years short of 477 solar years: and, if we consider them as lunar years of 360 days each, we shall be yet more in fault the other way; for 490 such years will be equal to 482 solar years and about 349½ days, which carries us almost six years beyond 477 solar years. So that, according to either mode of abbreviated computation, the 490 years cannot be made to quadrate with the 477 solar years which elapsed between the twentieth year of Artaxerxes Longimanus and the year in which our Lord was crucified.

2. Petavius and Abp. Usher compute, like Africanus, *the seventy weeks* from the grant of Nehemiah's commission in the twentieth year of Artaxerxes, though they differ materially from him in other particulars. They rightly judge, that, however the Jews might reckon single insulated years, a period of 490 of their years is virtually the same

* Christ was crucified in the month *Nisan* A. Æ. C. 33 and A. P. J. 4746, and Nehemiah received his commission from Artaxerxes in the month *Nisan* A. A. C. 445 and A. P. J. 4269.

as a period of 490 solar years. But this opinion, as Africanus was well aware, will not allow them to reckon 490 *solar* years from the *Nisan* in the twentieth year of Artaxerxes as that year is arranged in the canon of Ptolemy. Hence they place it from nine to ten years further back; the former making the *Nisan* in it to be the *Nisan* of the year 4259 of the Julian period and of the year A. C. 455, the latter making the *Nisan* in it to be the *Nisan* of the Julian year 4260 and of the year A. C. 454. From the *Nisan* then in the twentieth year of Artaxerxes, in which month Nehemiah received his commission *, Petavius, according to *his* arrangement of it, first computes *sixty-nine weeks* or 483 years; the period, which (we are taught by the prophecy) reaches from the going forth of the edict to rebuild Jerusalem unto Messiah the prince. This brings him down to the Julian year 4742, in which he places the baptism of Christ. He then reckons three years more for *the half week*, which brings him to the Julian year 4745. Here he places the crucifixion, by which the Levitical sacrifice and oblation was spiritually abolished †. In a similar

* Nehem. ii. 1.

† As Petavius is very brief, I shall give his system in his own words, more especially since I have intimated, that Prideaux appears to me to be mistaken in representing both him and Usher as *alike* computing *the seventy weeks* from the *Nisan*

similar manner, from the *Nisan* in the twentieth year of Artaxerxes, according to *his* arrangement of it, Abp. Usher first computes *the sixty nine weeks* or 483 years. This brings him to the *Nisan* of the Julian year 4743 and of the year 30 of the Christian era, in which month was celebrated the first passover of our Lord's public ministry. From his first passover he next reckons three years for *the half week*. This brings him to the fourth passover of Christ, which fell out in the Julian year

of the Julian year 4260. *Usher* undoubtedly does, but *Petavius* reckons them from the *preceding* year; though they *both* make the first year of Artaxerxes to *commence* in the Julian year 4240. " Sed nec illud præterire volumus; quod de duplici Artaxerxis exordio superius attigimus, utile imprimis esse ad 70 Danielis hebdomadas explicandas. Quarum initium ab anno Artaxerxis 20 ducimus; eo nimirum, quo edictum de instaurandis Hierosolymis exitum habere cœpit (Dan. ix. 25.): quem calumniis ac ludificationibus æmuli hactenus impedierant. Sed vicesimus iste Artaxerxis, non a morte Xerxis, sed a primo ejus initio, repetitur. Itaque primus annorum 490, quæ sunt hebdomadæ annales 70, convenit in A. A. C. 455, A. P. J. 4259, A. M. 3529. Septuagesima hebdomas iniit anno ipso, quo Christus a Johanne baptismo tingitur, A. P. J. 4742. Quare anno 3 hebdomadis Christus interfectus est: *In dimidio* (inquit Daniel ix. 27.) *hebdomadis deficiet hostia et sacrificium*, hoc est, *in ejus parte dimidia*, μεσαζουσης της ἑβδομαδος, labente hebdomade postrema, legalibus sacrificiis modus adhibebitur, quod ea morientis Christi vox indicat, *Consummatum est.*" Rationar. Temp. par. ii. l. iii. c. 10.

4746

4746 and in the year 33 of the Christian era. But at this fourth passover our Lord suffered upon the cross, and thus spiritually abolished the Levitical sacrifices by his one great oblation of himself once offered *.

The schemes of Petavius and Usher, which are *fundamentally* at least the same, seem to me to be as inadmissible as that of Africanus, though not altogether for the same reasons—1. The chronological arrangement, which with some variation they adopt, has been shewn to be erroneous, as contradicting the universal testimony of historians respecting the lengths of the reigns of Xerxes and Artaxerxes, and particularly as running counter to

* The plan of Abp. Usher is introduced into the chronological tables at the end of the common 4to. bible: but, because the twentieth year of Artaxerxes according to *his* arrangement of it commenced in the year A. C. 455, they erroneously represent *the seventy weeks* as *also* commencing from that year. Whereas, in his grace's plan, they commence, as Dr. Prideaux rightly states, from the *Nisan* of the *following* year 454, which corresponds with the Julian year 4260. For he supposes the twentieth year of Artaxerxes to commence *after* the *Nisan* in the year A. C. 455, and therefore to *include* the *Nisan* in the year A. C. 454. Consequently, the *Nisan* of the twentieth year of that prince, is, according to the Archbishop's arrangement, the *Nisan* of the *latter* of those years, not of the *former* of them. And this, as it appears to me, is the precise point wherein he and Petavius differ. But see Usser. Annal. in A. P. J. 4259, 4260.

the canon of Ptolemy. At any rate, though Petavius might elude the force of this objection by contending that he does not alter the *real* lengths of their reigns, it fully applies to the scheme of Abp. Usher—2. And, even if their chronological arrangement had been unexceptionable, *the interpretation built upon it* would nevertheless be liable to various objections. By placing the death of Christ in the middle of *the last week*, and not attempting to account for *the latter half* of it, they in effect throw *half of the seventieth week* out of the grand prophetic period, and thus render it altogether useless and insignificant. The prophecy speaks expressly of *seventy weeks:* in these interpretations it is expounded as if it spoke of no more than *sixty nine weeks and a half*. That *the whole seventieth week* however is significant, no less than *the former part of it*, is manifest from this circumstance: the same person, who causes the sacrifice and oblation to cease in *the midst of the week*, confirms the covenant with many for *one week*. But the person, who abolishes the sacrifice in *the midst of the week*, is supposed by Petavius and Usher to be Christ: therefore Christ must confirm the covenant with many for *one week*, which is plainly *the whole last week* of *the seventy*. According to the present interpretation however, Christ is put to death in *the middle* of *the last week*, during *the whole* of which,

not

not merely during *the first part* of it, he was to confirm the covenant with many. Now we may easily conceive why his *personal* confirmation of the covenant with many should be particularly noticed in the prophecy: but it is not so easy to assign a reason, which his confirming the covenant during *the half week* which elapsed *immediately after his death* should be more noticed than his confirming it during any *other* period *after his death**—3. The interpretation is inconsistent also in another respect. According to our common English translation, Messiah is to be cut off after *the sixty two weeks* added to *the seven weeks*, that is to say, after *the sixty nine weeks:* the interpretation represents him as being cut off, not *precisely* after *the sixty nine weeks* or *at the end* of them (which the word *after* must

* Speaking of this hypothesis, Dr. Blayney justly asks, "How can Christ be said to have *confirmed the covenant*, by "which *the gospel covenant* is understood, *with many for one* "*week*, when his ministry lasted by confession no more than "the half of it? Nor will it lessen the difficulty to allege, "that the same covenant continued to be promulged by his "disciples after his death for the remainder of the term. It "did so indeed; but not for one week only, but for many "more in succession: whereas the construction of the words "necessarily implies an action, of which the duration was li-"mited to one week only." Dissert. on the seventy weeks. p. 15.

import,

import, if it have any definite meaning), but *three whole years* subsequent to their expiration *.

3. There is yet another hypothesis, which computes *the seventy weeks* from the twentieth year of Artaxerxes, invented by Bp. Lloyd, adopted with some variations by his chaplain Mr. Marshall, and more recently by Mr. Butt, and approved of by Mr. Wintle.

These commentators maintain, that the years of *the seventy weeks* are lunar years of 360 days each, and that they are to be estimated without taking any intercalation into the account: hence *the sixty nine weeks*, which reach *unto the Messiah* and which contain 483 such years, they reckon as being equal to no more than 476 solar years and 21 days—The twentieth year of Artaxerxes, agreeably to the canon of Ptolemy, they rightly place in the year 4269 of the Julian period and the year A. C. 445—Reckoning then 476 solar years and 21 days from the *Nisan* of this year, they are brought to the second month *Ijar* in the year 4745 of the Julian period; where, consequently, they place the expiration of *the sixty nine weeks*—But, after *the sixty nine weeks*, Messiah is to be cut off. Accordingly, in the *Ni-*

* The force of the important word *after* will be discussed more fully when I come to the hypothesis of Dr. Prideaux, who has defended the use of it in what he terms *a large sense*, that is to say *an indefinite sense*.

san

san of the Julian year 4746, at the first passover after their expiration, our Lord suffered death upon the cross—Having thus disposed of *sixty nine weeks* out of *the seventy*, they entirely separate the remaining *single week* from its predecessors; and fix it, though with some variation, to the period of the Jewish war in which Jerusalem was sacked by the Romans under Titus. The Bishop and Mr. Marshall suppose it to have commenced about September A. D. 63, when the Romans made a treaty of peace with the Parthians and others, and to have terminated in September A. D. 70, when at the close of its *second half* Jerusalem was taken by them and the daily sacrifice abolished; thus placing an interval of no less than 31 years between the end of *the sixty ninth week* and the beginning of *the seventieth.* Mr. Butt makes it commence yet later, and conceives it to be the seven years of the Jewish war, which some reckon to have begun A. D. 66 and to have ended A. D. 73; about the middle of which war (speaking in round numbers) Jerusalem was taken and an end put to the daily sacrifice. The main argument for thus insulating *the last week* is what Mr. Marshall calls *its express character;* that is to say, the circumstance of our Lord's citing Daniel's phrase *the abomination of desolation*, and his fixing the appearance of it to the time of the Jewish

Jewish war *—At the end of *the seven weeks*, which form the first portion of *the sixty nine weeks*, Bp. Lloyd places the closing of the sacred canon by the addition of the book of Malachi: but Mr. Marshall conjectures, that the rebuilding of the city was completed at the time when they expired †.

(1.) This interpretation I can as little admit as either of the preceding ones. To say nothing of the erroneousness of its very *principle*, for we are not warranted in computing *a series* of years by lunar years of any description, there are many other additional objections to it.

(2.) The separation of *the seventieth week* from *the sixty nine weeks* is a palpable and capital defect. According to the analogy of every other numerical prophecy, *the seventy weeks*, let them *begin* when they may, must be *continuous*, unless some very irrefragable argument can be adduced to prove the contrary. But, in the present instance, no conclusive argument is brought to authorize the separation of *the last week* from its fellows. It is urged indeed, that *the abomination of desolation* mentioned in the 27th verse is to be referred to the era of the

* Matt. xxiv. 15.

† Bp. Lloyd's chronological tables iii. iv.—Marshall's Treatise on the seventy weeks—Butt's Comment. on the prophecy of seventy weeks—Wintle's Translation of Daniel in loc.

siege

siege of Jerusalem; and therefore that *the last week*, during which a covenant is confirmed with many, must be similarly referred. I readily allow, that such is the proper arrangement of *the abomination of desolation;* and I think it sufficiently clear, that *the half week* (as Mr. Marshall rightly understands the phrase rendered in our common version *the midst of the week**) belongs to the same period: but it does not therefore follow, that this is likewise the case with *the one week*. Mr. Marshall's *particular* translation indeed, "the half of *the* week," does no doubt fix *the one week* to the same period as *the half week*, because it represents *the half week* as being the half of *the one week:* but the original may just as properly be rendered "the half "of *a* week," which permits us to consider *the one week* and *the half week* as wholly distinct, the expression being a *general*, not a *particular*, one. To warrant therefore our referring *the seventieth week* to the same period as *the half week*, we must

* Dr. Prideaux agrees with Mr. Marshall in thus translating the original, as do likewise Sir Isaac Newton and Mr. Mede; and they are supported by the Vulgate, the Syriac, the Arabic, and the Greek version which bears the name of the LXX. Yet I think Prideaux and Marshall say too much in asserting that the phrase is *incapable* of being rendered *the midst of the week*. See Prideaux's Connect. Part i. B. v. p. 304—Marshall's treatise on the seventy weeks, p. 6, 254.

have

have some *direct proof* that it *ought* to be so referred: but, as far as I am able to judge, the evidence lies wholly on the opposite side of the question. In the 24th verse, before the prophet divides *the seventy weeks* into their minor constituent periods, he gives us a very full enumeration of the particulars contained within them. If then *the destruction of Jerusalem* be *the special event* which is to designate the termination of *the seventy weeks*, as Bp. Lloyd and Mr. Marshall suppose, we may naturally expect to find it mentioned in the 24th verse: for it cannot be deemed probable, that Daniel should omit this remarkable, this *special*, event in what may not improperly be termed *his table of contents*. Here however we find nothing of the sort alluded to. "Seventy weeks," says the prophet according to our common translation, "Seventy "weeks are determined upon thy people and upon "thy holy city, to finish the trangression, and to "make an end of sins, and to make reconciliation "for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righte-"ousness, and to seal up the vision and prophecy, "and to anoint the Most Holy." Such are the specified contents of *the seventy weeks*, in which not the slightest hint is given, that *the destruction of Jerusalem* is either comprehended within them or marks their termination. Surely then we cannot consider ourselves as warranted in separating *the last*

last week from *the sixty nine weeks*, and in applying it thus separated to the age of the Jewish war*.

(3.) So again: we are taught, according to our common translation, that *sixty two weeks* subsequent to *seven weeks* are to be reckoned *unto Messiah the Prince*, and that after those *sixty two weeks* he is to be *cut off*. From these terms of the prophecy it is argued in the present hypothesis, that *the death of Christ* is fixed to the termination of *the sixty nine weeks:* and, since the same *sixty nine weeks* are to be reckoned *unto the Messiah*, it is

* "Nor will the case be much improved by a third hypothesis; which, assuming a series of shorter, that is, Chaldaic years, of 360 days each, brings down the second period only to the death of Christ: after which, admitting a considerable interval, it begins again to reckon *the last week* a few years before the destruction of Jerusalem, so as finally to terminate in that catastrophè—Not to insist on the several objections that occur to other particulars, the breaking of the line of time, on which the whole stress of this hypothesis lies, must of itself appear in the highest degree exceptionable. For, either the limitation of a number of years in a prediction supposes those years to follow in continued succession; or it is in effect no limitation at all, nor of any use to ascertain the precise time of the event. On the contrary, how easily may the very same date be accommodated to the most distant periods imaginable, provided it be allowable to discontinue the reckoning at pleasure, and to resume it again, just where it may suit the turn of a fancied hypothesis." Blayney's Dissert. on the seventy weeks. p. 16, 17.

further

further argued, that the phrase *unto the Messiah* must mean *unto the death of the Messiah.*

I readily concede to Mr. Marshall, in opposition to Dr. Prideaux, that *the death of Christ* must occur at the end of *the sixty nine weeks,* if we understand the expression rendered *Messiah shall be cut off* to relate to *his death:* but the question is, how the other expression *unto the Messiah* can possibly denote *unto the death of the Messiah.* Between the two expressions there is a sufficiently plain *distinction:* the favourers of the present hypothesis are necessitated to consider them as being of the *same import* *. *Unto the Messiah* however cannot, except by a strangely forced and unnatural construction, mean *unto his death:* it must, by every rule of ordinary phraseology, mean *unto his coming* either *natural* or *official.* But, if *his coming* be at the end of *the sixty nine weeks,* as it *must* be if *unto the Messiah* mean *unto the coming of the Messiah,* it is plainly impossible that *his death* should *also* be at their end. Hence it will follow, either that the phrase *unto the Messiah* means *unto*

* "Though a pretty plain distinction seems to be made be-
" tween *the time of the Messiah's appearance* (ver. 25.), and *the*
" *cutting off*, which is said (ver. 26.) to be after *the threescore*
" *and two weeks*, yet in this hypothesis both are confounded to-
" gether, as if *unto the Messiah the prince*, and *to his death*,
" meant the same thing." Ibid. p. 16, 17.

his

his death, which the construction of no language will warrant; or that the other phrase, rendered *Messiah shall be cut off*, is improperly rendered. That the *latter* is the case, I have no doubt: both because the ordinary translation of the phrase confounds *his death* with *his coming*, which can only be meant by the expression *unto the Messiah;* and because it disagrees with the arrangement, which places *his death* at the end of *the seventy weeks*, and which (I think) may clearly be proved to be the right one.

The propriety of this arrangement of *his death* appears from the enumeration of particulars ascribed to the period of *the seventy weeks* at the very opening of the prophecy. Some one or more of these particulars must be supposed to mark their *termination:* otherwise it could not be said, that *seventy weeks* were the *precise* period within which *all* those particulars should be accomplished *. The termination however of *the seventy weeks* must, in that case, be marked by the *chronologically latest* of the particulars †. And the chronologically latest of the particulars may be proved to synchronize with *the crucifixion* ‡. Therefore *the crucifixion*

* See this point proved below in Chap. v. § 2.

† See Chap. v. § 2, 3. and Chap. vi. § I. 2.

‡ See Chap. vi. § I. 1. (1.) (2.) (3.) 2.

must

must mark the termination of *the seventy weeks*. But, if *the crucifixion* marks the termination of *the seventy weeks*, it cannot likewise mark the termination of *the sixty nine weeks*. Consequently, *the death of Christ* is *not* to be placed at the close of *the sixty nine weeks;* and *the seventieth week*, terminating as it does with *the death of Christ*, can *not* be referred to the age of the Jewish war.

On these grounds I maintain, that the phrase rendered *Messiah shall be cut off* is *erroneously* rendered *, because such a translation of it places *the death of Christ* at the end of *the sixty nine weeks*, and thus makes it synchronize with *his coming*. Mr. Marshall however maintains, that it is *properly* rendered; and is thence obliged to understand the other phrase *unto the Messiah* as meaning *unto his death*. Yet, apparently as if conscious that it must import *a coming* of *some* sort, he labours to shew that *unto the Messiah* means *unto his coming to his death*. But I doubt, whether either the Bible or any book in any language will afford him an instance of the expression *unto a person* denoting *unto the coming of that person to his death*. If *until John* † mean *unto the commencement of John's*

* As I shall hereafter shew, it ought to be actively translated *Messiah shall cut off*, not passively *Messiah shall be cut off*. See Chap. iv. § II. 8.

† Matt. xi. 13. Luke xvi. 16.

ministry,

ministry, and if *unto Moses** mean *unto the commencement of the legal dispensation;* then, by analogy, *unto the Messiah* must mean *unto the ministerial coming of the Messiah* or *unto the commencement of the Gospel dispensation which he came to promulgate*, not surely *unto his coming to his death.* But, if *unto the Messiah* mean *unto the commencement of his coming in the Gospel*, then *the sixty nine weeks* must expire with the beginning of John's ministry, because our Lord himself teaches us that *that* was the beginning of the Gospel dispensation†. Hence they plainly cannot expire with *the death of Christ:* and hence the phrase rendered *Messiah shall be cut off* must be improperly rendered.

After all, it is not unworthy of observation, that, severely as Mr. Marshall censures Dr. Prideaux for his no doubt unwarrantable extension of the meaning of the word *after*‡, his own scheme is similarly, though not equally, deficient in chronological exactness. The word *after* pins down *the cutting off of the Messiah*, or whatever else be meant by the phrase, *precisely* to the end of *the sixty nine weeks.* To prove this, the whole of Mr. Marshall's reasoning upon the word, which I think

* Rom. v. 13, 14. † See Luke xvi. 16.

‡ "*After* threescore and two weeks shall Messiah be cut "off." Dan. ix. 26.

perfectly

perfectly just, is directed. Yet does he consider *the sixty nine weeks* as expiring, not *with* the crucifixion, but eleven months *before* it and at an era distinguished by no event that adequately marks their termination.

(4.) To all that has been said I may add another objection, which alike affects every scheme of interpretation that computes *the seventy weeks* from the twentieth year of Artaxerxes. They are to be reckoned from *the going forth of an edict to rebuild Jerusalem.* Consequently, before any computation of *the seventy weeks* from the twentieth year of Artaxerxes can be allowed, it ought to be shewn that an edict *was* then enacted: and of such an edict I can find no traces in Scripture. As I have already observed, Artaxerxes merely *authorizes* Nehemiah to superintend the rebuilding of the city; nothing is said respecting any *decree* being enacted by him for that purpose.

Perhaps it may be argued, that the word דבר used by Daniel does not necessarily import *a decree enacted with all the formalities of law*, but may as well signify *a mere permission* or (as it is rendered in our common translation) *a commandment;* and that such a permission was granted to Nehemiah—To this I think it an abundantly sufficient answer to observe, that, when we consider the peculiar solemnity and importance of the prophecy

and

and the consequent necessity of computing *the seventy weeks* from some remarkably determinate era, and when we find that *three edicts* had been previously enacted *with every legal formality*, it is highly improbable that the date of the prophecy should be *a simple verbal permission* to put more effectually in force what had already been at least *twice* previously decreed by *regular written instruments*. When the whole of this circumstance is duly weighed, I cannot but esteem it very unlikely, that the Holy Spirit should design *the seventy weeks* to be reckoned, not from some one of *the three formal instruments*, duly enacted and afterwards carefully registered in the archives of the kings of Persia*; but from a subsequent *verbal permission* to superintend the rebuilding of Jerusalem and to push it on with greater rapidity than it hitherto had been done, granted by Artaxerxes to his cupbearer Nehemiah while waiting upon him at table †.

It

* See Ezra i. 1—v. 17—vi. 1, 2.

† The phrase מצא דבר, here used by Daniel, seems to be the official law language of the day. Exactly the same expression is employed by the author of the book of Esther to describe *the enacting of* (what is plainly) *a formal written decree*. See Esther i. 19. I would not however be understood to say, that, so far as the Hebrew idiom is concerned, the phrase *must* be taken officially, *wherever* it occurs. This must be determined

It is urged, I am aware, by the favourers of the scheme in question, that the permission granted to Nehemiah accords much more exactly with the terms of the prophecy in which the building of *the city* * is specially mentioned, than any one of the three written edicts: because the rebuilding of *the temple* is the chief subject of those of Cyrus and Darius, and because the restoration of *the civil and ecclesiastical polity* of the Jews is the chief subject of that of the seventh year of Artaxerxes †.

I reply,

by the context: but let any one judge from the context of Dan. ix. 25, whether the phrase be not *there* plainly used in a legal sense.

* Dan. ix. 25.

† "Various have been the opinions," says Mr. Butt, "concerning the time when the commandment to restore and "build Jerusalem went forth. Some have fixed upon the decree of Cyrus; others, upon that of Darius; and others, "upon that of the seventh year of Artaxerxes. But, if we "examine the forementioned decrees *as recorded in Scripture*, "we shall find that no one of them related to the rebuilding "of Jerusalem, its area, and wall, but to the rebuilding of the "temple, of which there is no mention here (Dan. ix. 25.) "whatever. But, if we turn to the second chapter of Nehemiah, we shall find, that, in the twentieth year of Artaxerxes, Nehemiah obtained permission from that king to rebuild Jerusalem, and to erect the wall of the city, which "consequently had not before begun to be restored—Where, "let me ask, can we find any other decree recorded in Scripture, which corresponds to the literal, obvious, and primary "sense

I reply, that, granting for the present that *the rebuilding of the literal Jerusalem* must be meant in the prophecy, both common sense, and other parallel passages of Scripture, require us to consider the rebuilding of *the city* as subincluded in any decree for (what the Jews esteemed of paramount importance) the rebuilding of *the temple*. Is it to be supposed, that, by the decrees of Cyrus and Darius, nothing more was intended than the rebuilding of *the temple?* Would, or did, the Jews conclude from them, that they were authorized indeed to rebuild their *temple;* but that, *when* rebuilt, it was to stand in solitary magnificence without a single dwelling house in its vicinity? The supposition is too absurd to be entertained for a single moment. We have no occasion however to depend upon abstract arguments: for, unless I be greatly mistaken, Scripture itself teaches us, both how we are to understand those edicts, and how in fact the Jews themselves *did* understand them. Isaiah, mentioning Cyrus even by name, twice predicts, that he should decree the rebuilding, not only of *the temple*, but likewise of *the city*. "Thus saith the

"sense of the prediction?" Butt's Commentary on the 70 weeks. p. 12, 13, 14. It may not be amiss to observe by the way, how Mr. Butt, as his argument draws to a conclusion, transforms into *a decree* what at first he had very properly called only *the permission* of Artaxerxes.

" Lord thy redeemer, and he that formed thee " from the womb: I am the Lord, that maketh all " things; that stretcheth forth the heavens alone; " that spreadeth abroad the earth by myself; that " frustrateth the tokens of the lyars, and maketh " diviners mad; that turneth wise men backward, " and maketh their knowledge foolish; that con- " firmeth the word of his servant, and performeth " the counsel of his messengers; that saith to Je- " rusalem, Thou shalt be inhabited, and to the ci- " ties of Judah, Ye shall be built, and I will raise " up the decayed places thereof; that saith to the " deep, Be dry, and I will dry up thy rivers; that " saith of Cyrus, He is my shepherd, and shall per- " form all my pleasure, *even in saying to Jerusa-* " *lem, Thou shalt be built*, and to the temple, Thy " foundations shall be laid*." And again: " I " have raised him up in righteousness, and I will " direct all his ways: *he shall build my city*, and " he shall let go my captives, not for price nor re- " ward, saith the Lord of hosts†." Nothing can be more express than the words of these prophecies: but they certainly never were fulfilled, if we limit the decree of Cyrus to the mere rebuilding of *the temple*. Hence it is plain, to make it quadrate with the predictions of Isaiah, that it must be in-

* Isaiah xliv. 24—28. † Isaiah xlv. 13.

terpreted as enacting the rebuilding of *the city*, as well as of *the temple**. And, if *it* be so inter-

* Mr. Marshall endeavours to invalidate the argument drawn from these texts in the following manner.

In Isaiah xliv. 28, he maintains, that the person, who says to Jerusalem *Thou shalt be built*, is not *Cyrus*, but *God*—I greatly doubt, whether the present Hebrew reading will bear such a gloss. Bp. Lowth indeed brings out the sense, which Mr. Marshall would ascribe to the passage; but he does it by altering the text. Bp. Stock, on the contrary, and perhaps more judiciously, retains the common reading, which there seems to be no just cause for altering; and thence puts the command into the mouth of *Cyrus*.

The other text, Isaiah xlv. 13, he finds more refractory. God there expressly says of Cyrus, *He shall build my city*. To elude the force of this text therefore, Mr. Marshall has recourse to two expedients. The one is, that this building of the city by Cyrus is to be considered as only *consequential* to his decree, not as enacted *in* it: the other is, that the word *city* is here to be understood as only denoting *the temple*—The bare mentioning of these expedients I conceive to be an ample confutation of them.

Mr. Marshall dwells much upon the city, in point of matter of fact, *not* being rebuilt until the days of Nehemiah—If he mean to say, that the reëdification of the city was not *completed* until then, he will find no person disposed to contradict him. But *this* is not the point. The question is, when the reëdification of the city *commenced*. Now Mr. Marshall wishes to fix its *commencement* to the twentieth year of Artaxerxes. Hence it was necessary for him to explain away the prophecy contained in Isaiah xlv. 13. How far he has succeeded in his attempt, let the cautious reader determine. Treatise on the seventy weeks. p. 151—158.

preted,

preted, analogy requires that the subsequent decree of Darius, which is plainly a repetition and confirmation of the original decree, enacted for the same purpose, and studiously (as it were) adopting the same law language, should be similarly interpreted*. Accordingly, as we may collect from their actions, the Jews *did* so interpret them; and no person appears to have objected to their interpretation, *on the ground that they exceeded the limits of their commission*, though their enemies attempted to impede the progress of the work, *on the score of their former rebellions*. Thus, in the days of the Magian Artaxerxes or Smerdis the successor of Cambyses, Bishlam, Mithredath, and their companions, write to the king to complain, that the Jews were come unto Jerusalem, building the rebellious and bad city, and setting up the walls, and joining the foundations: upon which Artaxerxes gives commandment, that they should cause those men to cease, and that the city should not be built†.

* If we may believe Josephus (and, that we may, the two prophecies of Isaiah seem to prove sufficiently), Ezra has given us no more than *an abstract* of the decree of Cyrus. The Jewish historian expressly tells us, that the decree of Cyrus related, not only to the rebuilding of *the temple*, but also of *the city;* and he afterwards informs us, that the decree of Darius was a mere repetition of that of Cyrus. Joseph. Ant. Jud. lib. xi. cap. 1. § 2, 3. cap. 4. § 7.

† Ezra iv. 7—16.

Hence

Hence it is manifest, that the Jews were then engaged in rebuilding *the city* conjointly with *the temple:* and this they could only have undertaken by virtue of the edict of Cyrus, because no other edict was then in existence. Thus likewise, *previous* to the commission granted by Artaxerxes to Nehemiah, Ezra speaks, not only of the setting up of *the house of God*, but of the building of *the wall of the city* under the protection of the kings of Persia *. And thus Haggai plainly represents the rebuilding of Jerusalem as being very considerably advanced in the second year of Darius immediately before the granting of his edict, because he reproaches the Jews with dwelling in ceiled houses, and with running every man to his own house, while they neglected the work of the temple and suffered it to lie waste †. That the city had not been rebuilt *with so much rapidity* as the patriotism of Nehemiah induced him to hope, and that *many parts* of it still lay waste in the twentieth year of Artaxerxes, is indeed sufficiently plain: but the idea, that it then only *began* to be rebuilt, and that two out of the three preceding edicts related solely to the building of *the temple*, is alike contradicted by Scripture, common sense, and matter of fact. To what has been said may be added, that the de-

* Ezra ix. 9. † Haggai i. 1, 4, 9.

cree

cree of the seventh year of Artaxerxes, which relates to *the restoration of the civil and ecclesiastical polity of Judah*, is so ample, that it is incredible that Ezra, with such an instrument in his hands, should not make the least effort to promote the rebuilding of the city. The king gives him unlimited powers to revive the temple service and to do for the house of God whatsoever is commanded by the God of heaven, and further authorises him to appoint magistrates and judges to judge all the people that are beyond the river*. Now, with such powers as these, and with the commandment of God in the prophecies of Isaiah before him relative to the rebuilding not only of *the temple*, but of *the city*, it is impossible to suppose that Ezra could imagine his authority to be so accurately confined to the restoration of the Jewish polity that he was not at liberty to rebuild a single house within the precincts of Jerusalem; or, if he *did* imagine such a thing, that he would not have applied for a more extensive commission, representing (as he might well have done) the little utility in his being permitted to restore the Jewish polity if he were not permitted to rebuild the city also.

II. A second class of commentators calculate *the seventy weeks* from the days of Darius, reckon-

* Ezra vii. 21—26.

ing

ing either from his third year, about which time his decree in favour of the Jews was enacted, or from his sixth year, when the temple was finished. This, on the supposition that the *Darius* of Ezra and Zechariah is *Darius Nothus* and not *Darius Hystaspis*, will bring them either to the year in which Jerusalem was sacked by the Romans, or about three years and a half beyond that time; thus placing the abolition of the daily sacrifice by Titus in the midst of *the seventieth week*. Scaliger and Mr. Mede are the chief patrons of this hypothesis *.

I think it superfluous to enter into a regular discussion of its minor particulars, because the scheme itself is built upon a palpable chronological error. It is true, that, between the third year of *Darius Nothus* which coincides with the year A. C. 421, and the year of our Lord 70 in which Jerusalem was taken, there are exactly 490 years: but, as I have already shewn, the *Darius* of Ezra was *Darius Hystaspis*, not *Darius Nothus;* and the date of his decree is nearly a century prior to the third year of the latter *Darius*.

III. A third class of commentators reckon *the seventy weeks* from the seventh year of Artaxerxes

* Scalig. de Emendat. tempor. lib. vi—Mede's Treatise on Daniel's Weeks. Works. p. 697—The author of the hypothesis was, I believe, Sulpicius Severus.

Longimanus,

Longimanus, in which, pursuant to the royal decree, Ezra went from Babylon to Jerusalem attended by a considerable body of Jews who had not hitherto availed themselves of the edicts either of Cyrus or Darius. Now the decree of Artaxerxes was enacted in the month *Nisan*, in the year 4256 of the Julian period and in the year A. C. 458. If then 490 years be computed from this era, they will bring us to the corresponding month *Nisan* in the year 4746 of the Julian period and in the year 33 of the Christian era; in the middle of which month, at the time of the Jewish passover, our Lord was crucified: so that, between the enacting of the decree in the seventh year of Artaxerxes and the death of the Messiah, there are precisely 490 years even to the very month. Of this hypothesis, variously modified, the chief patrons are Sir Isaac Newton and Dr. Prideaux, though it had been maintained before them by Funccius *.

1. Sir Isaac supposes, that *the seventy weeks* relate to *the first coming of our Lord as a prophet*, and that they are to be reckoned from the seventh year of Artaxerxes to the crucifixion †: but he does

* Sir Isaac Newton's Observ. on Daniel, chap. x.—Prideaux's Connection. part i. book v. p. 272.

† Sir Isaac slightly differs from Dr. Prideaux in his chronological arrangement both of the decree of Artaxerxes and of the

does not consider the smaller periods of *seven weeks, sixty two weeks,* and *one week,* as forming constituent successive parts of the greater period of *seventy weeks,* although their sum total be the same—*The seven weeks* he separates wholly from *the sixty two weeks,* adopting the punctuation of our common version, *Unto the Anointed the Prince shall be seven weeks: and threescore and two weeks shall it return, and the streets be built and the wall, but in troublous times;* instead of *Unto the Anointed the Prince shall be seven weeks and threescore and two weeks: it shall return, and the streets be built and the wall, but in troublous times:* and supposes, that they relate to *the second advent of our Lord,* and are to be reckoned from the era of the *yet future* restoration of the Jews. Hence he considers this part of the prophecy as unfulfilled: and, from the mention made of *a commandment going forth to rebuild Jerusalem* at the commencement of *the seven weeks,* he conjectures, that it may not come forth from the Jews themselves but from some other kingdom friendly to them, that it may precede their return from captivity, and that it may indeed give occasion to it—*The sixty two weeks* he separates both from *the seven weeks* and *the one*

the crucifixion; but he still preserves the exact distance of *seventy prophetic weeks* between them.

week;

week; and includes them within the compass of *the seventy weeks*, though he makes them neither begin nor end *synchronically* with *the seventy weeks:* on the contrary, instead of reckoning them from *the commencement* of that including period, he computes them from an era *considerably subsequent* to its supposed commencement. The era, which he pitches upon for this purpose, is the September of the Julian year 4278. This he does on the ground, that in that month of that year the wall of the city was finished by Nehemiah *. Reckoning then *sixty two weeks* or 434 years from this era, he is brought to September in the year 4712 of the Julian period, at which time, according to Clemens Alexandrinus, Irenèus, Eusebius, Jerome, Orosius, Cassiodorus, and other ancient writers, Christ was born. "How "after these weeks," he adds, "Christ was cut off, "and the city and sanctuary destroyed by the Ro- "mans, is well known"—He has now to dispose of *the one week*, and *the half week*. These he considers as two *distinct* periods, and does not suppose *the half week* to be the half of *the one week—The week*, during which our Saviour was to confirm the covenant with many, he conceives to be the seven years which elapsed between the crucifixion and the calling of Cornelius the first fruit of the Gen-

* Nehem. vi. 15.

tiles

tiles—*The half week*, in which he was to cause the sacrifice and oblation to cease, he supposes to be the three years and a half of the Jewish war, at the end of which Jerusalem was taken and the temple was burnt; commencing in spring A. D. 67, and terminating in autumn A. D. 70.

To this interpretation I make the following objections—1. The considering the smaller periods as *wholly distinct* from *the seventy weeks*, and as not being jointly *constituent parts* of them, is arbitrary and unnatural, violating the concinnity of the prophecy, and rendering the exposition of it altogether precarious and uncertain. Since *seventy weeks* are first mentioned apparently in a kind of introduction, and afterwards *seven weeks, sixty two weeks*, and *one week;* since these *seven weeks, sixty two weeks*, and *one week*, make up the precise sum of *seventy weeks;* and since all the numbers occur in one prophecy, and therefore in manifest connection with each other: the presumption is, that the smaller numbers are subdivisions of the larger number, and ought to be estimated as included within it—2. There is only one date of commencement to be found throughout the whole prophecy, namely, *the going forth of an edict to rebuild Jerusalem.* Sir Isaac, by confining this date to *the seven weeks*, by separating those *seven weeks* from all the other periods, and by making them commence from the yet

future

future rebuilding of Jerusalem and restoration of the Jews, leaves every other period without date. Hence, according to this scheme, I can see no reason why *the seventy weeks* should begin from the seventh year of Artaxerxes rather than from any other era: still less can I discover, why *the sixty two weeks* should be reckoned from the completion of the rebuilding of the wall of Jerusalem—3. But, even if there were a clear reason for thus reckoning *the sixty two weeks*, I cannot find that Nehemiah gives any warrant for placing the completion of the wall in the Julian year 4278, the latter part of which Sir Isaac, agreeably to his general arrangement of the reign of Artaxerxes Longimanus, makes to coincide with the 28th year of that prince. Nehemiah tells us, that the king granted him permission to go to Jerusalem, and to superintend the rebuilding of it, in the first Jewish month *Nisan* in the twentieth year of his reign*. A certain time must be allowed for his journey and for his delivering his letters to Asaph and the governors beyond the river. This, arguing from the similar journey of Ezra†, we may estimate at about four months. Immediately upon his arrival, that is to say, after waiting no more than three days, he seems to have

* Nehem. ii. 1, 6. † Ezra vii. 8, 9.

begun

begun the business of rebuilding the wall *. And we are at length taught, that it was finished on the 25th day of the sixth month *Elul*, its rebuilding having taken up the space of fifty two days †. Thus it appears, that, from Nehemiah's setting out on his journey in the month *Nisan* to the completing of the wall at the latter end of the month *Elul*, there was a period of not quite half a year; which will just allow about four months for his journey and 52 days for the building of the wall. Accordingly, both Abp. Usher and Dr. Prideaux very naturally place the completion of the wall in the same year that Nehemiah set out from Babylon, namely in the year that he received his commission from Artaxerxes: on what grounds Sir Isaac places it in the 28th year of Artaxerxes, eight years later, I know not—4. So again: it is difficult to conceive, why our Lord should be said to have confirmed the covenant with many during the first seven years after his death, rather than during any subsequent period. Through the instrumentality of his word and sacraments, he has surely been confirming the covenant with many, not merely for seven years, but down even to the present day—5. Lastly, according to our common English translation, which

* Compare Nehem. ii. 11—20. iii. iv.

† Nehem. vi. 15.

in

in this instance Sir Isaac Newton follows, Messiah is to be cut off *at the end* of *the sixty two weeks;* for such, as I have already observed, *must* (unless the phraseology of Daniel be altogether lax and indefinite) be the import of the word *after:* Sir Isaac places *his birth* at the end of *the sixty two weeks,* and consequently *his death* long after their expiration.

2. The hypothesis of Dr. Prideaux seems to me to be much more consistent than that of Sir Isaac, though neither is *it* altogether unexceptionable.

He observes, that the first clause of the prophecy * contains an enumeration of six particulars, for the accomplishing of which *the seventy weeks* are said to be determined. Hence he infers, that all these six particulars must alike mark the termination of *the seventy weeks,* the weeks expiring precisely when all the particulars were accomplished. But all these particulars he maintains to have been accomplished in *the crucifixion of our Lord.* Hence he necessarily concludes, that *the seventy weeks* expired when our Lord was crucified.

Having thus ascertained that *the seventy weeks* terminated with *the death of Christ,* he reckons back from that era 490 years in order to arrive at their commencement. Now the crucifixion took

* Dan. ix. 24.

place

place in the *Nisan* of the Julian year 4746. Consequently 490 years, reckoned back from that time, bring him to the *Nisan* of the Julian year 4256. But that year coincides with the seventh year of Artaxerxes Longimanus: and, in that very month of that year, Ezra received his commission to execute the king's decree in favour of the Jews.

The chronology of *the larger period* being settled, he proceeds to inquire into the proper arrangement of *the smaller periods*, which he considers as subdivisions and component parts of *the larger period—The seven weeks* or 49 years he allots to the rebuilding of Jerusalem: but the whole of this rebuilding he understands figuratively; and supposes it to relate, not to *the rebuilding of the literal Jerusalem*, but to *the reformation of the desolate Levitical Church and the restoration of the divinely ordained civil polity of Judah by Ezra and Nehemiah.* At the end of *the seven weeks* he places Nehemiah's last act of reformation; by which the mystic holy city, here described (in metaphorical language familiar to the sacred writers) under the name of *Jerusalem*, was completed, the work of its allegorical reëdification being carried on (as we repeatedly learn from the scriptural history of it) in troublous times and amidst great opposition from enemies—To *the seven weeks* he adds *the sixty two weeks;* the sum of which, or *sixty nine weeks*,

reaches, according to the prophet, *unto Messiah the Prince.* These *sixty nine weeks* then, or 483 years, reckoned from the seventh year of Artaxerxes, in which their including period of *seventy weeks* commences, are made, in the scheme of Dr. Prideaux, to bring us exactly to the coming of Christ in his official capacity: for, the seventh year of Artaxerxes coinciding with the year 4256 of the Julian period, 483 years calculated from that time will carry us down to the year 4739 of the same period, which the Dean maintains to be that fifteenth year of Tiberius Cesar mentioned by St. Luke as being the year in which the ministry of the Gospel commenced by the preaching of John the Baptist our Saviour's forerunner*—*The one week*, during which the Messiah was to make firm a covenant with many, and *the half week*, in which he was to cause the sacrifice and oblation to cease, now remain to be accounted for. This *single week* Dr. Prideaux arranges immediately consecutive to *the sixty nine weeks:* and supposes it to commence with the first preaching of the Gospel by John the Baptist in the Julian year 4739; and to expire at the crucifixion in the Julian year 4746, synchronically (as it necessarily must do, being *the last week*) with *the seventy weeks.* It was divided exactly into

* Luke iii. 1.

two

two halves: for the ministry of John the Baptist lasted three years and a half, and the personal ministry of our Lord himself lasted three years and a half more; the two periods conjointly making up seven years or *one week* of years. The whole of the latter *half week* was employed in causing the efficacy of the legal sacrifices to cease: and this was at length completed, and all the sacrifices of the law were rendered a dead letter, by the alone efficacious sacrifice of Christ upon the cross—But it is said, that Messiah should be cut off after *sixty two weeks;* that is to say, after *sixty two weeks* added to *seven weeks*, or after *sixty nine weeks:* here therefore a question arises, how this declaration quadrates with an exposition, which places his cutting off at the end of *the seventy weeks?* Dr. Prideaux replies, that the word *after* must be understood in *a large sense*, as not denoting *immediately after*, but *some time after:* and he argues, that such must necessarily be its meaning; because otherwise we should make *the coming of Christ* (which is fixed to the end of *the sixty two weeks* subsequent to *the seven weeks* by the phrase *unto the Messiah)* coincident with *his cutting off*, and thus allow no intermediate space for *his ministry.*

The numerical part of the prophecy being thus arranged, he next discusses that part of it which relates to the sacking of Jerusalem by the Romans.

The people of the prince that should come he conceives to be *the Roman armies;* and *the prince himself that should come*, their general *Titus.* Under his command, they overflowed Judèa like a torrent, and begirt Jerusalem with their ensigns, those abominations of desolation, which our Saviour, in allusion to this prophecy, had forewarned his disciples of.

With much that is excellent, this scheme contains also some matters that are liable to objection—1. I can see no reason, why we should suppose, that all the particulars enumerated in the exordium of the prophecy alike mark the *termination* of *the seventy weeks:* it seems more agreeable to the language there used by Daniel to conclude, that a period of *seventy weeks*, reckoned from some edict to rebuild the city, should *comprehend* them all; so that some one or more indeed should mark its *termination* (for *this* is plainly and necessarily required by the very terms in which the prophecy is couched), but that the remainder should occur *during* its lapse and *before* its termination. " Seventy weeks " are determined upon thy people and upon thy " holy city, to finish the transgression, and to make " an end of sins, and to make reconciliation for ini- " quity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness, " and to seal up the vision and prophecy, and to " anoint the most Holy." Without at present discussing

cussing the propriety of this version in all points, the most probable opinion that we can form of the meaning of the passage is, that, of the several particulars here enumerated, some should take place either earlier or later *in the course* of *the seventy weeks*, and that others should take place *exactly at their end*, thus definitely marking their termination: and this, if I mistake not, we shall hereafter find to be the case—2. As I believe, that Dr. Prideaux has arranged several of the particulars erroneously by fixing them all equally to the *close* of *the seventy weeks;* so I think, what indeed necessarily follows from this faulty arrangement, that in more than one instance he has misunderstood their import—3. His gloss upon the word *after*, where it is said that "*after* threescore and two weeks Messiah shall be "cut off," is to me altogether unsatisfactory. He is perfectly right in supposing, that *unto the Messiah* cannot possibly mean *unto his death;* and it is manifest, that they, who reckon *the sixty nine weeks* both *unto the Messiah* and *unto his crucifixion*, either give the phrase *unto the Messiah* a sense which it cannot bear, or allow no space for Christ's ministry: but still the question will recur, how far the plain words of the prophecy will authorise this gloss of Dr. Prideaux? Wherever certain numbers are specified, our interpretation must be adapted to the plain letter of such specification; not the specification

cification so explained away from its obvious meaning as to suit the interpretation which we may wish to adopt. Now let any person judge, when it is said, that *unto Messiah the prince* there should be *seven weeks* and *sixty two weeks;* and when it is next said, that *Messiah should be cut off* (as the original is rendered in our translation and as it is understood by Dr. Prideaux) after *the sixty two weeks* subsequent to *the seven weeks:* let any person judge, whether the precise termination of *the sixty two weeks* is not plainly to be marked by *the cutting off of the Messiah.* I believe indeed, as I have already intimated, that the original phrase is improperly translated: but this circumstance does in no wise affect the present argument. Let the expression mean what it may, the event described by it, whether it be *the death of the Messiah* or *something else,* must either *completely take place* (if it be momentary in its nature), or *begin to take place* (if it be not momentary in its nature), *precisely* at the expiration of *the sixty two weeks* subsequent to *the seven weeks.* By understanding the word *after* in what Dr. Prideaux calls *a large sense,* we destroy all the definiteness of a numerical prophecy: for it were of little use to specify the number *sixty two,* if *after sixty two weeks* meant no more than *indefinitely subsequent to them.* Such an explanation wholly destroys that precision of phraseology necessary

necessary to render any language certainly intelligible. Were we to say, that Charles the second of England succeeded to the throne *after* his father's death, we should not, it is true, speak an absolute *falsehood:* but who does not perceive, that we should express ourselves with such a strange degree of inaccuracy as no language can tolerate; who does not perceive, that in *this* sense of the word *after* we might say with equal truth that the third George reigned *after* the first Charles? Since the death of our Saviour takes place (according to Dr. Prideaux) at the end of *the seventy weeks*, it is incredible, that the prophet, if speaking of *that death* in the phrase which is rendered *Messiah shall be cut off*, should declare that it should occur after *sixty two weeks* subsequent to *seven weeks*, when he might so easily have expressed himself with perfect accuracy by foretelling that it should happen after *sixty three weeks* subsequent to *seven weeks*, thus by the definite word *after* fixing it precisely to the termination of *the seventy weeks*. If *the death of Christ* then *be* meant by the original phrase which our version renders *Messiah shall be cut off*, it certainly must be fixed (as Bp. Lloyd, Mr. Marshall, and Mr. Butt, rightly maintain) to the termination of *the sixty two weeks* subsequent to *the seven weeks*, that is to say, to the termination of *the sixty nine weeks*. But, in this case, the objection to their

hypothesis,

hypothesis, which I have already noticed, will still recur: by acknowledging (as they must do) that *the sixty nine weeks* reach *unto the Messiah*, and by yet placing *the death of the Messiah* at the end of *the sixty nine weeks*, they are compelled to interpret *unto the Messiah* as denoting unto *the death of the Messiah;* an interpretation, which the usage of no language will tolerate. In short, both schemes are equally objectionable in this particular, though on different accounts. The one produces a consistent and rational explanation indeed, but which the letter of the prophecy will not warrant. The other proposes to adhere to the letter of the prophecy, and interprets the word *after* as it doubtless ought to be interpreted; but it produces an explanation, which the phraseology of no language will bear, because it makes *unto the Messiah* to mean unto *the death of the Messiah.* Nor yet, after all, *does* it adhere to the letter of the prophecy, though it *claims* to do so as its peculiar and exclusive excellence. As I have already observed, instead of placing the death of Christ *precisely* at the end of *the sixty nine weeks*, which the word *after* requires if *his death* be spoken of in the phrase rendered *Messiah shall be cut off*, it makes *the sixty nine weeks* expire little less than *a year* before the crucifixion*—4. So again;

* Mr. Marshall objects, at considerable length and with much force of argument, to this unwarrantable gloss of Dr. Prideaux

again: Dr. Prideaux supposes *the prince that shall come*, who is mentioned in the 26th verse, to be *Titus;*

Prideaux upon the word *after*. He observes also, and with equal justice, that the system of Mr. Lancaster, which places (as we shall shortly see) *the cutting off of the Messiah* in the middle of *the last week* and therefore three years and a half subsequent to the expiration of *the sixty nine weeks*, is similarly unwarrantable, though not to so great an extent. He might also have extended his censure to Sir Isaac Newton, Petavius, and Usher; the two last of which writers, like Mr. Lancaster, place the death of Christ about *half a prophetic week* after the end of *the sixty nine weeks*. He does not however seem at all to consider, that his arguments may be turned against himself. His own hypothesis is equally objectionable *in kind*, though not *in degree*, with those which he so justly censures. He, in common with all these authors, supposes, that the original expression ought to be translated *Messiah shall be cut off;* and thence, upon such a supposition, unanswerably maintains, that *the cutting off of the Messiah* is fixed by the preposition *after* to the termination of *the sixty nine weeks*. Yet does he place the crucifixion, not *precisely* at the end of *the sixty nine weeks*, but *eleven months after* their end. In short, the only difference is this: Dr. Prideaux places *the cutting off of the Messiah* seven years after the expiration of *the sixty nine weeks;* Petavius, Abp. Usher, and Mr. Lancaster, about half a prophetic week; Sir Isaac Newton, the whole duration of Christ's life; and Bp. Lloyd, Mr. Marshall, and Mr. Butt, about eleven months. If the preposition *after* is to be understood as definitely marking the end of *the sixty nine weeks*, which Mr. Marshall argues unanswerably to be the case; then his hypothesis is untenable even upon his own principles. After his just, though somewhat vehement, censure of

Dr.

Titus; and yet conceives, that *the person who is to confirm the covenant with many for one week,* spoken of in the 27th verse, is *Christ.* This the context of the passage will not allow, as must, I think, appear to any person who attentively considers it. " After threescore and two weeks shall

Dr. Prideaux's *large sense* of the word *after*, it is not a little curious to observe *himself* claiming to take a *similar*, though not quite so *extensive*, a liberty with this same word. " Since," says he, " we find these words literally and expressly in the " prophecy, *After threescore and two weeks shall Messiah be cut* " *off*, we are necessarily tied down to *the cutting off of the Mes-* " *siah*, if not *strictly* and *immediately* after the very day of their " expiration, however so far forth *after*, as that it was impos- " sible for so much as one *whole year* of another *week* to pass " away without the accomplishment of this grand event of this " predicted period." The meaning of which in plain English is this: it is perfectly warrantable to extend the signification of *after* nearly a whole year, because such extension is necessary for Mr. Marshall's hypothesis; but it is quite unwarrantable in others to extend it three years and a half or seven years. Yet who does not see, that, if not Dr. Prideaux, yet Petavius, Usher, and Lancaster, might have argued with little less speciousness, that the death of the Messiah was so tied down by the text to the end of *the sixty nine weeks*, that he must be cut off, " if not *strictly* and *immediately* after the very " day of their expiration, however so far forth *after*, as that it " was impossible for so much as another *whole week* to pass " away without the accomplishment of this great event of this " predicted period?" See Marshall's Treatise on the seventy weeks. p. 200—215.

" Messiah

" Messiah be cut off, but not for himself: and the
" people of the prince that shall come shall destroy
" the city and the sanctuary; and the end thereof
" shall be with a flood, and unto the end of the
" war desolations are determined. And he shall
" confirm the covenant with many for one week:
" and in the midst of the week he shall cause the
" sacrifice and oblation to cease, and for the over-
" spreading of abominations he shall make it deso-
" late even until the consummation, and that de-
" termined shall be poured upon the desolate."
Now, unless we suppose Daniel to pass in a most unaccountable manner from Titus *the prince that should come* to Christ *who confirms the covenant*, and then from Christ *who confirms the covenant* to Titus *who makes it desolate*, we must allow, that *the prince that should come* (whoever he may be) is the person uniformly spoken of from the first mention of him to the end of the prophecy. And, in that case, if *the prince that should come* be *Titus*, then *Titus* must be alike *the person who confirms the covenant with many* and *the person who makes it desolate*. Dr. Prideaux's interpretation therefore of *the prince that should come* necessarily overturns his interpretation of *the one week* (for the two cannot stand together), and would compel us rather to refer that *one week* (namely *the seventieth week*) to the era of the Jewish war, as Bp. Lloyd, Mr. Marshall,

Marshall, and Mr. Butt (though with some variations), do refer it: but then, as I have already stated, by adopting this latter hypothesis, we separate *the one week* from *the sixty nine weeks*, and thus make in the chronology of the prophecy a break which seems to me intolerable—5. There is another capital objection to the scheme of Dr. Prideaux. He understands *the abolition of the sacrifice and oblation in the half week* to mean *the spiritual abolition of the Levitical sacrifices, first by the preaching of our Lord during the latter half of the seventieth week, but chiefly by his one sacrifice of himself at the end of it.* Now the plain untortured context of the passage will compel any unprejudiced person to conclude that *this abolition* synchronizes with what in our version is rendered *and for the overspreading of abominations he shall make it desolate.* But this latter clause *must* relate, as Dr. Prideaux himself justly explains it, to the era of the Jewish war in which Jerusalem was sacked by Titus. Therefore, since the former clause evidently describes something synchronical, *the abolition of the sacrifice*, thus synchronizing with the siege of Jerusalem, must mean *the literal abolition of the Levitical sacrifices*, which (as it is well known) was then effected. In this manner accordingly it is very properly interpreted by Lloyd, Marshall, Butt, Mede, Scaliger, and (as we shall presently see) by Blayney

Blayney—6. It may finally be objected to Dr. Prideaux, that he understands the rebuilding of Jerusalem *figuratively*, instead of *literally;* and that he makes the Julian year 4739 to synchronize with the fifteenth year of Tiberius when John is said by St. Luke to have commenced his ministry, whereas according to Ptolemy it synchronizes with the twelfth year of that prince: but, as I think him right in both these particulars, I shall reserve my defence of them to a future part of this work.

3. Cornelius à Lapide, after discussing other systems, gives the preference to that which computes *the seventy weeks* from the seventh year of Artaxerxes. He asserts however, that not *the seventy weeks* themselves, but that *sixty nine weeks and a half*, expire with the crucifixion; by which great event he thus supposes the Levitical sacrifices to have been spiritually abolished in the middle of *the seventieth week*. This arrangement of the crucifixion fixes the baptism of Christ to about the termination of *the sixty nine weeks*. Hence he argues, that *unto the Messiah*, by which he understands *unto the commencement of the personal ministry of the Messiah*, there were *sixty nine weeks* agreeably to the declaration of the prophecy *.

* Cornel. a Lapid. Comment. in Dan. in loc. p. 1353, 1354.

This

This scheme, were it chronologically accurate, would certainly be less objectionable than some others: but the misfortune is, that it is built upon a gross error in calculation. Between the enacting of the decree of Artaxerxes in the seventh year of his reign and the crucifixion of the Messiah, there are not *sixty nine weeks and a half* or $486\frac{1}{2}$ years, but precisely *seventy weeks* or 490 years.

IV. A fourth class of commentators would adopt the first year of Cyrus as the date of the prophecy, an opinion anciently advanced by Eusebius and Clemens Alexandrinus.

1. Among these Dr. Blayney, the late eminently learned professor of Hebrew in the University of Oxford, has proposed an interpretatio ı which differs radically and essentially from all those that have hitherto been considered, inasmuch as it is founded on a complete alteration of the numbers which heretofore have been the basis of every exposition. His authority for this alteration is partly the Greek version of Daniel by the LXX, the manuscript of which has long been sought after, and has at length been discovered in the Chigian library at Rome*; and partly conjectural emendations of this version, de-

* I have already observed, that the Greek version, which generally bears the name of the LXX, seems to have been the work of Theodotion.

duced

duced in a measure from two Hebrew manuscripts*.

* My remarks on Dr. Blayney's interpretation will be rendered more clear by exhibiting in one point of view his translation of the prophecy.

24. Weeks sufficient have been terminated (*or* completed) upon thy people and upon thy holy city, to check the revolt, and to put an end to sins, and to make atonement for iniquity, and to bring again the righteousness of ancient times, and to seal (*that is*, authenticate) the divine oracle and the prophet, and to anoint (*that is*, sanctify anew) the most holy things.

25. And thou shalt know and understand, that from the going forth of a decree to rebuild Jerusalem unto the Messiah the Prince shall be seventy and seven weeks and threescore and two years: it shall be rebuilt, still enlarging itself and becoming more and more considerable, even amidst times of distress.

26. And, after the times seventy and seven and threescore and two, Messiah shall cut off from belonging to him both the city and the sanctuary; the prince that shall come shall destroy the people; and the cutting off thereof shall be with a flood (*that is*, a hostile invasion); and unto the end of a war carried on with rapidity shall be desolations.

27. But he shall confirm a covenant (*or* make a firm covenant) with many for one week: and in the midst of the week he shall cause the sacrifice and meat-offering to cease; and the abomination of desolation shall be upon the border (*that is*, encompassing and pressing close upon the city and the temple); and an utter end, even a speedy one (*or* even until an utter end, and that a speedy one), shall be poured upon the desolated.

Instead

Instead of the numbers *seven* and *sixty two* in the 25th verse, and the number *sixty two* in the 26th verse, the translation in question reads in both places *seventy seven* and *sixty two**; adding in one of the places the word *times* † to the number *seventy seven*, and in the other place the word *years* ‡ to the number *sixty two*. In this translation therefore, the reading in the 25th verse is *seventy seven times and sixty two;* and that in the 26th verse, *seventy seven and sixty two years*.

Of neither of these readings much sense can be made: Dr. Blayney therefore, to improve them, has recourse to conjectural emendation, resting however in part upon a very ancient manuscript in the Bodleian library catalogued *Laud* A. 162, and presumed to be not less than 800 years old. That manuscript, in the 25th verse, prefixes ו to ששים, and substitutes the word שנה for the word שבעה: so that, instead of שבעים שבעה ושבעים ששים ושנים, which both our translation, and every one of the ancient versions §, renders *seven weeks and sixty and two weeks*, it reads שבעים שנה ושבעים וששים ושנים, *seventy years and weeks both sixty and two*. The first reading then of the Chigian Greek manuscript,

* Επτα και εβδομηκοντα —— εξηκονθα δυο.

† Καιρους. ‡ Ετων.

§ At least so the Syriac and Arabic read in the Latin translations of them.

in

in the 25th verse, is *seventy seven times and sixty two:* its second reading, in the 26th verse, is *seventy seven and sixty two years:* and the reading of the Laud Bodleian Hebrew manuscript is *seventy years and weeks both sixty and two.* Out of these three readings Dr. Blayney selects, by the aid of conjecture, what he maintains to have been the genuine original reading of the 25th verse, *seventy and seven weeks and threescore and two years.*

The true reading of the 26th verse he supposes to be *the times seventy and seven and threescore and two.* This slight difference between the readings in the two verses, which (as he rightly observes) must be understood to speak of one and the same period, he makes on the authority of another ancient Bodleian manuscript catalogued *Huntingdon,* No. 12, which immediately subsequent to ואחרי *and after* inserts העתים *the times.* This reading he conceives to be the origin of the καιρες in the Chigian Greek manuscript.

The seventy weeks in the 24th verse, with which the prophecy opens, still remain to be accounted for. Here Dr. Blayney makes no alteration in the original expression, except reading the first word שבועים instead of שבעים, which is warranted by the collation of Dr. Kennicott and de Rossi, and which the Masoretic punctuation considers as the proper reading. But, instead of translating it *weeks*

seventy, he renders it *weeks sufficient*. To the verb נחתך in connection with it he ascribes, what undoubtedly appears to be its primitive import, the sense of *cutting*; but he supposes it here to denote *cutting off* in the sense of *finishing*. Hence he translates the whole clause *weeks sufficient have been finished* or *terminated*.

On these important alterations he builds the following exposition.

Instead of considering the *sufficient weeks* prospectively, as all those interpreters do who render the original expression *seventy weeks*, he conceives them to mean *the seventy years of desolations* spoken of at the beginning of the chapter *, which were on the point of terminating at the time when the prophecy was delivered. Hence he necessarily considers all the particulars ascribed to the *sufficient weeks* and enumerated in the 24th verse, as accomplished at the expiration of the Babylonian captivity of *seventy years*—To establish this hypothesis, he translates the first clause of that verse *to check the revolt* instead of *to finish the transgression*; observing very justly, that פשע " is not a generic term " for *every transgression*, but marks *that particu-* " *lar species which consists in withdrawing the al-* " *legiance that is due to a lawful sovereign.*"

* Dan. ix. 2.

Now,

Now, the constitution of Israel being a theocracy, idolatry, which was practised so constantly by the people before the captivity, was strictly a revolt from their heavenly king. But, after their return from captivity, they did not, at least *nationally* and *generally* they did not, relapse into their former idolatrous practices *. So far therefore *the seventy years* desolation of Jerusalem might properly be said to have been designed to check the revolt—The three next clauses he renders *to put an end to sins*, and *to make atonement for iniquity*, and *to bring again the righteousness of ancient times*. These particulars, thus linked together, he considers as "so perfectly corresponding with the design of "every wise and good governor in inflicting punish- "ment, that no argument seems necessary to jus- "tify their application to that severe but whole- "some discipline, with which God had been pleased

* Dr. Blayney states the matter in far too unqualified terms, when he says, "After the return of the Jews from Babylon, "we do not find that they ever again relapsed into their for- "mer idolatrous courses." As *a nation* they might not, nor might idolatry be ever again *publicly established* and *supported* by *the government:* but, as Bp. Horsley observes, "from the "time of Antiochus Epiphanes to the last moments of the "Jewish polity, there was a numerous and powerful faction "among them, which in every thing affected the Greek man- "ners; and the Hellenising party were idolaters to a man." Translation of Hosea. p. 8.

" to visit and chastise his chosen people in the tem-
" porary desolation of their country*"—The fifth clause he translates *to seal the divine oracle and the prophet*. By *the prophet* here mentioned, he understands *Jeremiah*, who was commissioned to deliver the prophecy of *the seventy years captivity:* and, by *sealing the oracle and the prophet who re-*

* In explaining himself more particularly, Dr. Blayney afterwards says, " If the punishment inflicted on the Jews proved " the means of recovering them from their backslidings and " idolatry, *of expiating their iniquity*, and working in them a " thorough reformation and amendment, it would of course " be a means of restoring them to the divine favour" (Dissert. on the seventy weeks. p. 22.). Now, although כפר be not always used in the Levitical sense of *atonement by vicarious expiatory sacrifice;* yet, since the *English* expression *to make atonement for iniquity* seems (in treating of theological subjects) to be limited to the strict Levitical acceptation of the verb, I cannot refrain from thinking, that, as the professor evidently understands it extra-levitically, he would have acted more judiciously had he translated it differently. His present version of it, when explained by the accompanying gloss, might certainly lead an incautious reader to suppose, that Dr. Blayney was inclined to advocate the strange crude notion which we sometimes hear advanced, that *our sufferings here make a sort of atonement for the sins which we may have committed*, that *in consequence of them we shall be punished less severely hereafter*, that *this world in short is a kind of terrestrial purgatory*. I think indeed, that the clause *ought* to be translated as Dr. Blayney *has* translated it; but then I think likewise, that it ought to be *understood* in a very different manner.

vealed

sealed it, he conceives to be meant *the authenticating their truth;* which was done, when the prediction was accomplished by the commencement of the restoration of Judah and of the rebuilding of the temple and city in the first year of Cyrus—The last clause he translates *to anoint the most holy things.* This he applies to *the sanctifying anew of the temple and sacred vessels.*

He now proceeds to the date of the vision as mentioned in connection with the numbers *seventy seven weeks and threescore and two years*, which he substitutes for those that occur in the 25th verse—The period so specified he computes from the first year of Cyrus, when the original decree respecting the rebuilding of the temple and city was enacted. Now *seventy seven prophetic weeks* are equal to 539 years. Consequently, if we compute this number of years from the year A. C. 536, which is allowed to be the date of the decree of Cyrus, we shall come to the fourth year of the Christian era. But the birth of Christ (he says) is generally acknowledged to have been in the third or fourth year before the commencement of that era. It will fall therefore within the course of *the seventy seventh week*—As he supposes, that *the seventy seven weeks* are to be reckoned to the nativity of Christ or his first coming in the flesh; so he conceives, that *the sixty two years* are to be reckoned forward to his figurative

figurative coming to destroy Jerusalem *. If therefore we compute *sixty two years* from the termination of *the seventy seven weeks* in the year of our Lord 4, we shall be brought to the year 66, the very year in which the Jewish war broke out.

During the whole of the compound period *seventy seven weeks and sixty two years*, the rebuilding of Jerusalem was going on in troublous times; for, notwithstanding it was five times taken in the course of it, it continued to increase in consideration, until, at the era when it was sacked by Titus, it had attained to such a pitch of splendor, magnificence, and strength, as it had never known before even under the most powerful and independent of its monarchs.

In the 26th verse, the same numbers *seventy seven and sixty two* again occur, though with a trifling difference in the phraseology, the general expression *times*, according to Dr. Blayney's emendation, being connected with them both. Our common version here reads, that, after the period specified, whatever it may be, *Messiah shall be cut off, but not for himself; and the people of the prince that shall come shall destroy the city and the sanctuary:* but Dr. Blayney translates the passage, *Messiah shall cut off from belonging to him both*

* Matt. xvi. 28; xxiv. 3.

the

the city and the sanctuary; the prince that shall come shall destroy the people. Accordingly, in the course of the Jewish war, which commenced at the end of *the seventy seven weeks and sixty two years*, Christ, the predicted Prince that should come, cut off from belonging to him both the city and the sanctuary, and by the instrumentality of the Romans overwhelmed the people with a tremendous destruction.

Yet, nevertheless, for *one week* he was to confirm the covenant with many. This *single week* Dr. Blayney applies to the seven years of the Jewish war, commencing exactly where *the sixty-two years* terminated. The *many* he supposes to be the Christians, shut up for a season with the Jews in Jerusalem. The *covenant* is our Lord's assurance, that, though the unbelievers should be swallowed up in the days of vengeance, not a hair of *their* heads should perish *. Accordingly, as it is well known, after Cestius had invested Jerusalem and had shut up nearly the whole nation within its walls assembled together at the feast of tabernacles, he suddenly in a most unaccountable manner withdrew his troops to a distance, and thus gave the Christians an opportunity of availing themselves of their

* Luke xxi. 18, 19.

Lord's

Lord's admonition and of making their escape from that devoted city.

In the midst of *the week* however, Messiah, by the agency of his instruments, was to cause the sacrifice and oblation to cease. Thus, in the middle of the seven years *, Jerusalem was taken and destroyed, the temple burnt, and an end for ever put to the Levitical service †.

(1.) That the praise of no ordinary ingenuity is due to this interpretation, and that it obviates many difficulties which every other may be charged with, few will be disposed to deny: but to admit it requires a spirit of adventurous criticism, which I freely acknowledge *myself* at least not to possess. Yet I would not rashly throw aside an hypothesis, *merely* because it is deeply tinctured with this spirit. So much have the interests of sacred literature been promoted by the labours of a professor, whose loss is still deplored in the University to which he was so bright an ornament, that nothing which he has advanced ought to be lightly regarded. Let us then examine, with caution and sobriety, how far we are warranted in admitting or rejecting the gi-

* That is, as Dr. Blayney allows, *about* the middle. The fact is, according to his arrangement of the seven years of the Jewish war, the daily sacrifice ceased at the beginning of the fifth year.

† Blayney's Dissert. on the seventy weeks.

gantic

gantic alterations which Dr. Blayney has proposed.

We may *first* observe, that no one manuscript authorises them *in toto:* they are culled in a manner perfectly arbitrary from three different manuscripts and the common Hebrew text. The first of the manuscripts reads *seventy seven times and sixty two,* and *seventy seven and sixty two years*;* the second reads *seventy years and weeks both sixty and two†;* and the third reads, in the 26th verse, *the times the weeks sixty and two‡:* while the reading of our common Hebrew bibles, in the 25th verse where the full number is given, is *weeks seven and weeks sixty and two.* From all these Dr. Blayney selects at pleasure the reading *seventy seven weeks and sixty two years* for the 25th verse, and the reading *the times seventy seven and sixty two* for the 26th verse—Nor does he select the constituent members of these two approved readings from the precise places where they stand in the manuscripts. The word *times* occurs in the Chigian manuscript in the 25th verse: in the Huntingdon Bodleian ma-

* The Chigian Greek MS. of the LXX.

† Heb. MS. Bodleian. catalogued *Laud* A. 162.

‡ Heb. MS. Bodleian. catalogued *Huntingdon.* No. 12. This manuscript, Dr. Blayney says, inserts *the times* immediately after the word *after.*

nuscript,

nuscript, it occurs in the 26th verse*. Dr. Blayney rejects it from his reading in the 25th verse, and adopts it in his reading in the 26th verse—The Chigian manuscript omits *years* after *sixty two* in the 25th verse, and places it after *sixty two* in the 26th verse: the Laud Bodleian manuscript omits *years* after *sixty two*, and substitutes it for *seven* after *seventy:* the Huntingdon Bodleian manuscript omits it altogether. Dr. Blayney refuses to substitute it for *seven* and to place it after *seventy* on the authority of the Laud Bodleian manuscript, or to place it after the full number *seventy seven;* but places it exclusively after *sixty two*—The word *weeks* no where occurs in the Chigian manuscript: but, in the Laud Bodleian manuscript, it is attached to the second number *sixty two*, while the *years* are said to be *seventy*. Dr. Blayney places *weeks* after the first number, which he reads *seventy seven;* and

* I strongly suspect, that the word העתים *the times*, which occurs in this manuscript immediately after the word *after* at the beginning of the 26th verse, and which Dr. Blayney considers as a reading of no small importance, has crept into the text solely through the error of some careless transcriber who wrote the manuscript in question. It is observable, that העתים is the last word in the 25th verse. The eye of the transcriber glancing upon it as he was beginning to copy the 26th verse, he has a second time written it through inadvertency after ואחרי, where it ought not to have been written.

years,

years, after the second number *sixty two*—Now surely the whole of this must be considered as purely arbitrary and uncertain; and we can place little reliance upon readings, thus culled at pleasure, and combined into a sentence which we are required to receive as the genuine declaration of God's Holy Spirit. How much indeed Dr. Blayney is compelled to have recourse to conjecture, and how little satisfied he is with the Chigian manuscript in its present form, is manifest from his own testimony respecting it. "In it," says he, "though "there appears much mangling, interpolation, and "transposition, some valuable readings have been "preserved."

We may *next* observe, that, when alterations of such magnitude and importance as the present are proposed to us, it is natural to inquire whether they are warranted by any of the ancient versions: for the testimony of no manuscript now extant, nor the authority of a single version like that contained in the Chigian manuscript, can be allowed to weigh against the united authority of the Hebrew text and all the other ancient versions, supposing them to agree on the point in question. Now the common Hebrew text, and all the ancient versions, except that of the LXX adduced by Dr. Blayney and supposed to be contained in the Chigian manuscript, *do* agree on the point in question; for they uniformly

formly read in the 25th verse *seven weeks and sixty two weeks;* and, though the common Hebrew and some of the versions give the number imperfectly in the 26th verse reading there only *sixty two weeks,* this manifest omission is supplied by the Arabic and the Greek version of Aquila, both of which read *seven weeks and sixty two weeks* as in the 25th verse. To this may be added the testimony of Africanus and the other ancient expositors, all of whom construct their interpretations on the supposition that the genuine reading is *seven weeks and sixty two weeks.* Before we adopt Dr. Blayney's emendations, which after all, in the form in which *he* exhibits them, occur in no one version and in no one manuscript: before, under such circumstances, we adopt Dr. Blayney's emendations in direct opposition to a whole cloud of witnesses, we may, to say the least, be allowed to hesitate.

We may *further* observe, that, in comparing together the merits of various readings, it is a good rule to adopt that, which seems to be most imperiously required by *the concinnity* of the whole passage. Now the expression שבועים שבעים in the 24th verse is uniformly rendered by all the ancient versions, and by every expositor except Dr. Blayney, *seventy weeks.* Afterwards, according to the common Hebrew and every ancient version except that contained in the Chigian manuscript, we read

of

of *seven weeks*, *sixty two weeks*, and *one week*. Here we may note three circumstances: 1. that the 24th verse is apparently a sort of prologue to the whole prophecy, in which the largest and therefore probably the leading number is given, and after which Daniel proceeds to the subdivisions of his subject; 2. that, when he proceeds to these subdivisions, we find three smaller numbers, which jointly make up the precise sum of the larger number in the prologue; and 3. that one uniform notation of time, that by *weeks*, is used throughout. Let us put these circumstances together; and then judge, whether there be not strong internal evidence, that the passage in which they all meet, as exhibited in the common Hebrew and all the ancient versions except that in the Chigian manuscript, contains the genuine readings of all the numbers. But, in Dr. Blayney's emendations, we discover *no* such concinnity, *no* such internal evidence of authenticity. If שבועים שבעים be translated *seventy weeks*, as I think the subsequent context, in which *weeks* are so frequently mentioned, seems most naturally to require; it then plainly cannot be applied to the Babylonian captivity, and no less plainly cannot comprehend the *larger* numbers which (according to Dr. Blayney's emendations) are mentioned subsequently to it. Nor is this the sole objection: instead of the simplicity of only *one* mode of computation,

putation, that by *weeks*, the prophet is made to adopt the complexity of a *double* mode of computation, that by *wecks* and by *years*. From this statement let any unprejudiced critic decide, whether the commonly received readings, or those proposed by Dr. Blayney, bear upon them the most unequivocal marks of genuineness.

Lastly we may observe, that the question is in reality reduceable to this: whether we are to correct the common Hebrew text by the numbers recited in the Chigian manuscript, provided we *cannot* satisfactorily account for the appearance of such numbers in a Greek translation; or whether we are to retain the numbers recited in the common Hebrew text, provided we *can* satisfactorily account for those which appear in the Chigian manuscript. To a reader unacquainted with the Hebrew language it will doubtless seem passing strange, that, without some *very* great corruption in the original text, any Greek translator could metamorphose *seven weeks and sixty and two weeks* into *seventy and seven times and sixty and two* in the 25th verse, and into *seventy and seven and sixty and two years* in the 26th verse; for such are the two Chigian readings, which form the basis of Dr. Blayney's proposed emendations. This however might easily have been done by a person who read the Hebrew precisely as it *now* occurs in the 25th

verse: nor is there any occasion to impeach the integrity of the *present* text, in order to account for the numbers *seventy and seven* and *sixty and two* which occur in the Chigian Greek manuscript.

The word שבעים, written as it is written in *the prophecy of the seventy weeks* without the medial servile *Vau*, may signify either *weeks* or *seventy*; and the word שנים may, in a similar manner, signify either *years* or *two*. From this ambiguity, when the Masoretic points are thrown out of the question, I have little doubt that the translation in the Chigian manuscript has originated. The following is the manner in which I account for its appearance.

The passage, that contains the ambiguous words שבעים and שנים, stands thus, in our common Hebrew bibles, in the 25th verse; שבעים שבעה ושבעים ששים ושנים: and I believe, that Daniel wrote it in the same form in the 26th verse, though it now occurs there in a mutilated and defective shape*. This passage, agreeably to all the ancient versions except the Chigian, and agreeably to the manner in which it was understood by Africanus and other early com-

* This opinion is confirmed by the circumstance of the *complete* reading being preserved in the 26th verse, the same as in the 25th, by the Arabic and the Greek of Aquila.

mentators,

mentators, is rendered in our English version *seven weeks and threescore and two weeks:* yet, if we disregard the points which are acknowledged to be of no authority, we may translate it *weeks seven and seventy sixty and two.* Let us suppose then, that the author of the Chigian version thus at first rendered the passage both in the 25th verse and in the 26th verse: and we immediately have the very *numbers,* which now appear in that translation, and which are patronized by Dr. Blayney. Let us next suppose, that some subsequent copyer, upon turning to the original, observed the word שנים; and, conceiving it to mean *years,* added the word *years* after *sixty and two* in the 26th verse, but neglected to add it in the 25th verse: and we then obtain one of the *substantives* of the Chigian version. Let us further suppose, that another copyer, whose eye happened to glance on *times,* the last word of the 25th verse, carelessly substituted it for *weeks:* and we then obtain the other *substantive* of the Chigian version.

Thus, by a mere mistranslation of the *present* Hebrew text, we may produce the very *numbers,* which appear in the Chigian version, and which constitute the foundation of by far the most important part of Dr. Blayney's hypothesis: and thus, by supposing two corruptions to have taken place in the *primary* translation, both of which are easily accounted

accounted for, we may produce the two *substantives*, which *now* appear in that version, and which in his amended readings he has conjecturally disposed as might best suit his intended explanation. Since then he allows (what indeed is sufficiently apparent) that the Chigian manuscript has been grievously mangled and interpolated, and since his favourite readings may be thus easily obtained without impeaching the integrity of the common Hebrew text, I cannot persuade myself to give up that text in favour of what I believe to be *a corruption of a mistranslation*.

(2.) But let us for a moment concede to Dr. Blayney all that he could wish; let us allow his emendations to exhibit the genuine autograph of Daniel, though they appear not in the precise form in which he brings them forward in any one manuscript or version: *the propriety of his exposition* will still remain to be considered. Let us then, acknowledging for the sake of argument the validity of his premises, proceed to discuss the exposition founded upon them.

In order to be able to consider what is usually translated *seventy weeks* retrospectively, Dr. Blayney renders the original expression *sufficient weeks*, and supposes it to denote *the period of the Babylonian captivity* then on the point of expiring. On this it may be remarked, that such a mode of speak-

ing of a past period is unknown in Scripture, and even in the translation sounds most singularly harsh and unnatural. It may also be remarked, that, if such *really* be Daniel's meaning, he has chosen the most inconvenient phraseology to express it that could possibly have been devised. Since the word *weeks* occurs so frequently in connection with the numbers specified in the subsequent context, few translators would ever imagine, that by the original word שבעים attached to the same word *weeks* in the opening of the prophecy he meant us to understand, not *seventy* which is a number, but *sufficient* which is not a number. Indeed to render the word in any other manner than by *seventy* is to charge Daniel with labouring to be affectedly obscure, when he might with the utmost facility have written perspicuously. At the very beginning of the chapter which contains the prophecy, mention is made of *the seventy years**. Surely then, if Daniel had been here alluding to *the seventy years*, he would have written as he had already done שבעים שנה, and not have needlessly perplexed his meaning by writing שבעים שבעים; the natural and obvious translation of which is *seventy weeks*, and which, to make it have any relation to *the seventy years*, must in defiance of the whole subsequent context

* Dan. ix. 2.

be

be translated *sufficient weeks.* When these matters are duly considered, it must, I think, strike every person, that Dr. Blayney's version has been adopted merely to serve a turn. If the expression be rendered *seventy weeks,* it cannot look *retrospectively* to *the seventy years:* and, if it do not look *retrospectively,* it must look *prospectively:* and, if it look *prospectively,* then it never can be reconciled with Dr. Blayney's favourite numbers *seventy seven weeks and sixty two years.* It was necessary therefore to strike out some more flexible translation; and that, which has been pitched upon, is *weeks sufficient.*

But to bring the matter to a point: the following arguments appear to me decidedly to prove, that the old version is the proper one; and, consequently, that the period first mentioned by Daniel cannot look *retrospectively.*

The expression שבעים שבעים is rendered in all the old versions *seventy weeks*:* it is understood

* Of the oriental translations I judge through the medium of a *Latin* version: but I think it only fair to observe, that the *original* phrase which they employ may possibly, from their affinity to the Hebrew, be similarly ambiguous; that is to say, it may be *capable* of being rendered *weeks sufficient* as well as *weeks seventy.* I conclude, that the MS. version of the LXX does not favour Dr. Blayney's translation of the phrase, as he does not adduce it as an authority.

in this manner by all the ancient commentators, who frame their expositions accordingly: the Jewish writers, however troublesome the prophecy which contains it may have been to them in their controversies with the Christians, have never thought of adopting a different translation: the general context of the whole prediction imperiously requires, that the common version should be retained: and the new version, proposed by Dr. Blayney, is at once singularly harsh and uncouth, exhibits Daniel as affecting unnecessary obscurity, brings out a mode of expression which has no parallel in Scripture, and is palpably contrived for no other purpose than to enable its author to deny the *prospectiveness* of the term in question. But, if the phrase שבעים שבעים, though *capable* no doubt (so far as the bare *letters* are concerned) of being rendered *weeks sufficient*, must necessarily for the preceding imperious reasons be translated *seventy weeks*, the *retrospectiveness* of the first clause of the prophecy must plainly be untenable: for we shall fruitlessly labour to discover any completion of it in the precise number of 490 years *previous* to Daniel's vision. It follows therefore by an inevitable consequence, that, if the first clause do not look *retrospectively*, it must look *prospectively:* and so, accordingly, it has been generally, and (I think) rightly, understood.

This

This position, if well established, invalidates of course the whole of Dr. Blayney's interpretation of the first clause. We must conclude from it, that, whatever sense נחתך is *capable* of, in the *present* instance it has been erroneously translated, in being rendered *have been terminated.* We must likewise conclude from it, that, whatever be the precise idea which we ought to affix to the fifth particular *the sealing of the vision and the prophet*, it can have no relation to the authentication of Jeremiah's prophecy of *the seventy years desolation of Jerusalem.* And we must lastly conclude from it, that the sixth particular, *the anointing of the most holy* or *the anointing of the holy of holies*, cannot be applied to *the sanctifying anew of the temple and sacred utensils* after the return from the Babylonian captivity: *this*, I say, we must at least conclude, whatever may be the import of the expression *holy of holies;* and whether it *must* denote *inanimate objects* as Dr. Blayney contends, or whether it *may* denote *a person*, as I am rather inclined to believe.

Let us however examine the use, which Dr. Blayney makes of the numbers proposed in his emendations. According to the new reading, we are told, that, *from the going forth of a decree to rebuild Jerusalem unto the Messiah the prince, shall be seventy and seven weeks and threescore and two years.* Now, if there be any definite meaning in these

these words, they must import, that Messiah should come, either naturally or officially, at the end of the term specified; that is to say, at the end of the complete period of *seventy seven weeks and sixty two years.* What might happen at the end of *the weeks*, or for what purpose a *twofold* mode of reckoning was adopted and the first term of *the weeks* separated from the second term of *the years*, does not appear: but, that Christ was to come at the end of the *whole* compound period, in some sense or other, is asserted in as plain language as can be devised. Yet Dr. Blayney maintains, that a *twofold* coming of Christ is here predicted: *his natural coming*, at the end of *the seventy seven weeks; his figurative coming* to destroy Jerusalem, at the end of the additional *sixty two years.* For such a gloss I cannot discover the least shadow of authority even in the reading which he himself wishes to be adopted. It is not said, that *there should be seventy seven weeks unto the Messiah*, and again *seventy seven weeks and sixty two years unto the Messiah*, which might have warranted the idea of *a double coming* being intended: but it is simply said, that *there should be seventy seven weeks and sixty two years unto the Messiah.* Hence, from *this* reading, I cannot see that we have a right to place *any* coming of the Messiah at the end of *the seventy seven weeks.*

But

But this is not all. Supposing the reading to be genuine, we must at least conclude that something remarkable happens precisely at the end of *the seventy seven weeks*, on account of which they are divided from the subsequent *sixty two years* by the adoption of a different mode of computation. Now Dr. Blayney's wish is to place the first coming of our Lord in the flesh at the close of *the seventy seven weeks*, and his figurative coming to execute judgment on Jerusalem at the close of the additional *sixty two years*. Such being the case, we surely have a right to expect perfect accuracy of coincidence, before an assent to the hypothesis can be reasonably required of us. Yet is Dr. Blayney obliged to allow, that, according to his computation, *the seventy seven weeks* expire in the fourth year of the vulgar Christian era; which he reckons to be about six or seven years *after* the birth of Christ. According to this arrangement, the birth of Christ will indeed fall *in* the *seventy seventh week* *:

* Dr. Blayney speaks of the nativity as occurring in the third or fourth year before the vulgar Christian era, which enables him to include it in the 77th week. But, if it fell out at the latter end of the Julian year 4709 or about 4 years before that era, where Prideaux places it, it would not fall within the 77th week, but in the last year of the 76th, because 77 weeks reckoned from the first year of Cyrus will expire in the Julian year 4717.

but that is not the point; the number is *seventy seven weeks;* and we have no right to consider an event, which happens only at the beginning of *the seventy seventh week*, as coming up to the plain import of a numerical prophecy, which by mentioning *seventy seven weeks* must lead us to expect something to happen *precisely* at the end of those weeks. I must therefore, and do, maintain, that the present hypothesis makes *the seventy seven weeks* expire at an era when nothing remarkable occurred; and that the birth of Christ, which fell out *previous* to their expiration, cannot, agreeably to any fair rules of interpreting a *numerical* prophecy, have the least connection with it *.

As

* Dr. Blayney might, with greater plausibility, have calculated *seventy seven weeks* from the decree of Cyrus to the birth of Christ by estimating the years of those weeks as years consisting each of only 360 days. The 25th verse, as it stands in the present Hebrew text, *may* be translated, if we disregard at once both the points and all the ancient versions, in the following manner: "Know and understand, that from the going "forth of a decree to rebuild Jerusalem unto Messiah the "Prince shall be weeks seven and seventy: sixty and two "[*weeks*] it shall be rebuilt, still enlarging itself and becoming "more considerable, even amidst times of distress." Now 77 weeks contain 539 years: and 539 years of 360 days each are equal to 531 solar years and $92\frac{1}{4}$ days. But the decree of the first year of Cyrus was enacted in the Julian year 4178, and the birth of our Saviour is commonly placed towards the latter

As Dr. Blayney is unable to make the birth of Christ coincide with the termination of *the seventy seven weeks;* so, in order to arrive at the figurative coming of our Lord, he is obliged to take the years that elapse between the nativity and the *real* close of *the seventy seven weeks*, and to add them to *the sixty two years:* for, between *the literal first coming of Christ* and *his figurative coming* there are *more* than *sixty two years.* This contrivance is so very unnatural and far-fetched, that it appears to me to carry the marks of error in the very face of it *.

And,

latter end of the Julian year 4709. Consequently, between these two events there are *something more* than 531 solar years; that is to say, there are *precisely* 77 weeks of years of 360 days each. The coincidence is somewhat curious: but with this *single* coincidence the matter must stop: for, though the number *seventy* might be got rid of by translating the expression in the 24th verse *sufficient weeks* instead of *seventy weeks*, it will be not very easy to shew how 62 weeks or 434 years of 360 days each, equal to 427 solar years and 278¼ days, were the precise time employed in the rebuilding of the city. Besides, even to the coincidence itself, singular as it may be thought, the mode of calculation which produces it may be objected. Had it ever occurred to Dr. Blayney, he would doubtless like myself have rejected it on the single score that a computation by years of 360 days each is altogether indefensible.

* Dr. Blayney attempts to defend it against this objection, but in a manner to myself at least not at all satisfactory. "A very learned friend," says he, "who was early made acquainted

And, that such is the case, will, I think, be made yet further evident by noticing another objection. The scheme of Dr. Blayney, instead of exhibiting the consistent simplicity of the present Hebrew text, makes Daniel adopt a *double* mode of computation, by *weeks* and by *years*. Now, if Daniel

" quainted with the proposal of accounting for *the seventy* " *seven weeks and threescore and two years*, as stated in the pre- " face, was staggered with the objection that arose from trans- " ferring the surplus of years in *the seventy seventh week* to the " following period: an objection, which would equally have " weighed with me perhaps, had the time been computed from " the going forth of the decree unto the birth of the Messiah " *seventy seven weeks*, and from the birth of the Messiah unto " his second coming *threescore and two years*. But the form " of the expression leads us to compute two advents, not the " latter from the former, but both alike from the going forth " of Cyrus's decree: so that, *allowing from that decree to the* " *first coming of Christ to be seventy seven weeks*, yet it is also " said, that from that decree to the second coming should be " *seventy seven weeks and threescore and two years*, that is, in " all six hundred and one years." The answer to this is obvious: the scheme requires us to allow that two comings of the Messiah are predicted; one at the end of *the seventy seven weeks*, and the other at the end of the additional *sixty two years*. But we *cannot* allow there to be 77 weeks from the going forth of the decree of Cyrus to the first coming of Christ, as we are here called upon to do; because (Dr. Blayney himself being judge) there are *not* 77 weeks, but only 76 weeks and about 1 year, or (according to Dr. Prideaux) only 75 weeks 6 years and a fraction of another year.

did

did adopt this double mode, he must have adopted it for some good reason: and I know not any that can be adduced, except the circumstance of something very remarkable occurring precisely at the end of 539 years, which happening to amount to the exact sum of 77 prophetic weeks might lead him to adopt notation by weeks rather than by years; and the circumstance of something else equally remarkable occurring precisely at the end of 62 additional years, which not being reduceable to exact weeks might in the second term lead him to adopt notation by *years* rather than by *weeks*. I know not, I repeat it, any good reason, except this, that can be assigned for his departing from the simplicity of one uniform mode of notation: for we can scarcely suppose that he would have departed from it through mere wantonness. But this reason will not meet the objection made against Dr. Blayney's hypothesis. Nothing remarkable *does* occur at the end of *the seventy seven weeks*. Supposing therefore that the prophet had meant to direct our attention both to the nativity and the figurative coming of Christ, he surely would not have given up simplicity of notation for no other cause (as it were) than to be purposely inaccurate, when by adopting *one uniform mode* of notation he might have expressed himself with perfect accuracy: he surely would have said, had he meant what Dr. Blayney

Blayney ascribes to him, *five hundred and thirty and one years and seventy years*, not *seventy and seven weeks and sixty and two years**. The one would have been accurate and simple: the other is alike deficient in accuracy and simplicity.

There is an argument of professor Michaelis to prove, that the numerical readings in the prophecy of *the seventy weeks* must have been originally different from what they are at present, and that they must have been such as to warrant the expectation of a coming of the Messiah about the era of the destruction of Jerusalem, which, as far as it goes, Dr. Blayney notices with approbation, because it confirms his opinion that *the sixty two additional years* reach to the figurative coming of Christ in judgment: but he thinks, that it does not go far enough. The argument is founded on a passage in Josephus's history of the Jewish war, in which he observes, that, what chiefly animated his countrymen to take up arms, was an ambiguous oracle found in their sacred writings, that ABOUT THAT TIME *some one from their country should rule over the world.* "This," says Josephus, "they under-"stood as appropriated to themselves, and many

* I say this on the supposition that the birth of Christ fell out in the Julian year 4709 or about four years before the common Christian era.

"of

" of the wise men were mistaken in their judgment " concerning it: but what the oracle pointed out " was the sovereignty of Vespasian, who was pro- " claimed emperor in Judèa*." The same observation is made likewise by the heathen historians Suetonius † and Tacitus ‡. From these premises Michaelis reasons in the following manner. " 1. " That, since the oracle spoken of was one that " marked out a certain determinate time, it could " be no other than this prophecy of Daniel; be- " cause, though there were others in the sacred

* Το δε επαραν αυθις μαλισθα προς τον πολεμον, ην χρησμος αμφιβολος ὁμοιως εν τοις ἱεροις ἐυρημενος γραμμασιν, ὡς ΚΑΤΑ ΤΟΝ ΚΑΙΡΟΝ ΕΚΕΙΝΟΝ απο της χωρας τις αυθων αρξει της οικεμενης. Τελο δι μεν ὡς οικειον εξελαβον, και πολλοι των σοφων επλανηθησαν περι την κρισιν· εδηλε δ' αρα περι την Ουεσπασιανε το λογιον ἡγεμονιαν, αποδειχθενθος επι Ιεδαιας αυθοκρατορος. Lib. vi. c. 5. § 4. Edit. Hudson.

† " Percrebuerat Oriente toto vetus et constans opinio, esse " in fatis, ut eo tempore Judæa profecti rerum potirentur. Id " de imperatore Romano quantum eventu postea prædictum " paruit. Judæi ad se trahentes rebellarunt." Suet. de vit. Vespas. cap. iv.

‡ " Pluribus persuasio inerat, antiquis sacerdotum literis " contineri, eo ipso tempore fore, ut valesceret Oriens, profec- " tique Judæa rerum potirentur. Quæ ambages Vespasianum " ac Titum prædixerant. Sed vulgus, more humanæ cupi- " dinis, sibi tantam fatorum magnitudinem interpretati, ne " adversis quidem ad vera mutabantur." Tacit. Hist. lib. v. c. 13.

writings

" writings which foretold of the Messiah, there " was none but this that pretended to assign the " precise time of his coming. 2. That the oracle, " which drew the Jews into rebellion and was so " egregiously mistaken by their wise men, was the " same which that historian applied to the emperor " Vespasian. And therefore 3. That the time, " mentioned in the prophecy, must have appeared " to coincide with the times of the Jewish war and " of Vespasian's exaltation to the imperial dignity. " But it was impossible (he thinks), that, not the " vulgar only, but even the learned among the " Jews, and Josephus himself a man eminently " skilled in chronology, could have so far miscal- " culated the time, as they must have done accord- " ing to every supposition, if they had found *se-* " *venty weeks* only in their sacred copies, as we " read at present *." Of this argument Dr. Blayney approves; but observes, that it will extend a great deal further than Michaelis has carried it. " For it is very certain," he most justly remarks, " that the expectations of the coming of the Mes- " siah were never stronger nor more universally " prevalent among the Jews, than about the time " of our Saviour's birth. Hence the numbers of " those, who in Jerusalem are said to have *waited*

* Blayney's Dissert. on the seventy weeks. p. 31, 32.

" at

" at that time for *redemption* and *the consolation of*
" *Israel**; persons far advanced in years too, to
" one of whom notwithstanding it had been *re-*
" *vealed by the Holy Ghost that he should not see*
" *death until he had seen the Lord's Christ* †.
" Hence also the jealousy of Herod, lest this great
" person should supplant him in his kingdom; and
" hence his bloody attempt to cut him off in his
" infancy ‡. Hence the flocking of the multitudes
" to John the Baptist §, and their *musing in their*
" *hearts whether he were the Christ or not* ‖.
" Nor was it the common people only, whose at-
" tention was thus attracted towards him; their
" very rulers themselves sent the ministers of reli-
" gion to inquire into his character, who seemed
" very much disturbed and perplexed when they
" heard him declare that he was not the Christ ¶.
" When our Saviour himself appeared afterwards,
" the whole nation almost seemed ready to devote
" themselves to his service, if he would but have
" taken upon himself the state and character of a
" temporal prince and deliverer; for such they had
" fondly conceived their Messiah would be. And,
" when they found themselves disappointed in him

* Luke ii. 25, 38.
† Luke ii. 26.
‡ Matt. ii. 3, 16.
§ Matt. iii. 5—Mark i. 5.
‖ Luke iii. 15.
¶ John i. 19—28.

" who

" who was indeed the real Messiah although his " kingdom was not of this world, they were many " of them ready to follow the fortunes of impostors, " by whom they were frequently betrayed to their " ruin *. These early expectations must be sup- " posed to have some scriptural foundation like- " wise; for scarce any thing else could have pro- " cured them such strong and universal credit." From this very just statement, and from the preceding argument of Michaelis, jointly considered, Dr. Blayney draws the following inference in favour of his own hypothesis. " The time of our " Saviour's birth was at too great a distance from " that of which Josephus has spoken (being a dif- " ference of not less than seventy years), for to " admit a supposition that the one could possibly " be mistaken in calculation for the other. What " then? Had this scriptural prophecy fixed on " both times for the Messiah's appearance? It " had done so upon the footing on which I have " placed it; but, I think, after no other plan or " mode of interpretation whatever."

I must confess, that the argument of Michaelis seems to me to be very insecure ground to alter a received text of Scripture upon.

* Acts v. 36, 37. xxi. 38—Joseph. Antiq. lib. xx. c. 7. § 6, 10—De bello Jud. lib. ii. c. 13. § 4, 5. Edit. Hudson.

Allowing

Allowing that Josephus alludes to the prophecy of *the seventy weeks*, we shall find it no difficult matter to account for the opinion that prevailed during the Jewish war respecting the speedy manifestation of the Messiah without being obliged to correct any of Daniel's numbers—Four different edicts having been issued by the kings of Persia, or at least three and a verbal permission, the Jews, before the event, would obviously be uncertain from which of them they ought to compute the times of the Messiah. Without being able perhaps to understand the precise reason why *seventy weeks* were specified, they would at least be sure, that *unto Messiah the prince* there should be *seven weeks and threescore and two weeks.* The expression *unto the Messiah* they would naturally suppose to mean *unto the coming of the Messiah:* hence, whatever might be their opinions respecting his birth and origin, they would look out for *some* manifestation of him at the end of *sixty nine weeks* or 483 years —Since they knew not *a priori* whether the edict of Cyrus might not be the edict intended by Daniel, they would obviously be upon the tiptoe of expectation, as 483 years, reckoned from the first year of Cyrus or the year A. C. *536*, began to draw towards a close. These years would expire in the year *53* before the vulgar Christian era, or about 49 years before the birth of Christ: and precisely

about this time the Jews began to look out for the coming of Messiah the prince. This is manifest from the testimony of St. Luke; who gives us reason to believe, that, among the many who had been looking for redemption in Jerusalem at the era of the nativity, Anna the prophetess had been daily attending in the temple in expectation of her Lord's appearance at least fifty or sixty years, if not eighty four *. The year A. C. 53 however passed by, and the

* Luke ii. 36, 37, 38. There is an ambiguity in the language of St. Luke, so that it may be doubtful whether Anna was eighty four years of age, or had been a widow eighty four years. Supposing however the former, since she lived with her husband only seven years, she must have been attending the temple in expectation of the Messiah most probably at least fifty years. Dr. Prideaux thinks, that she had been looking out for his appearance full eighty years, and gives much the same reason for it that I have done, though not quite in such definite terms. " For several years before the birth of " Christ, not only Simeon and Anna the prophetess, but the " whole nation of the Jews, were in earnest expectation of his " coming and of the redemption of Israel by him—The pro- " phecies of Daniel and other prophets of the old Testament " having not only spoken of the righteousness, glory, and " bliss, of the kingdom of the Messiah, but determined his " appearance to the very time when it happened, gave just " reason for this expectation; and, for above eighty years be- " fore Christ's birth, the whole house of Israel were big here- " of. For so long Anna the prophetess being actuated by it " had attended at the temple in fasting and prayer to wait his " appearance.

the Messiah was not manifested. They would therefore be convinced, that the edict of Cyrus was not intended—The next was that of Darius, about the year A. C. 519; from which, if they reckoned again 483 years, they would be brought to the year A. C. 36. Still there is no appearance of the Messiah. But their faith does not fail: they are still *looking*, which plainly denotes a long continued act, *for redemption in Jerusalem*—At length the Saviour is born before the expiration of 483 years reckoned from the third edict, that of the seventh year of Artaxerxes. Simeon, Anna, and the pious expectants, received him with joy; and would then be convinced, that *unto the Messiah* did not mean *unto his natural coming in the flesh*, but *unto his official coming in the character of the great prophet of the Most High.* Satisfied however as believers might be, the unbelieving Jews would continue to look out for the appearance of the Messiah as still fu-

" appearance. And therefore for so long a time these prophe-
" cies, and the received interpretations of them, being much
" talked of throughout all Judèa with a view to the speedy
" completion of them, especially after Pompey had subjected
" that country to the Roman yoke, from thence the same
" manner of discoursing of them, and the same expectations
" of their being speedily accomplished, became diffused to all
" the Jews of the dispersions, wherever they were, all the
" world over." Connect. Part ii. b. ix. p. 677, 678.

ture: and they now would have their eyes fixed upon the edict of the seventh year of Artaxerxes in the year A. C. 458. Time rolls on; and the fatal 483 years again expire. Precisely at their expiration John the Baptist makes his appearance, and announces the coming of the Christ. How greatly the minds of all were affected by this circumstance, is sufficiently evident from the narratives of the evangelists; and how, notwithstanding the remarkable coincidence, the bulk of the nation obstinately refused to acknowledge Jesus as the Messiah, is abundantly well known—As it appears to me, they could only have withheld this acknowledgment, consistently with their own principles, on the ground, that Jesus might be an impostor who availed himself of the termination of the 483 years reckoned from the seventh year of Artaxerxes; whereas they ought in truth to be reckoned from his twentieth year, and therefore had not as yet expired. And in favour of this opinion they might have adduced some very plausible reasoning, as Bp. Lloyd, Mr. Marshall, Mr. Butt, and others, have shewn. Time again rolls on: Jesus is rejected and ignominiously crucified: the 483 years once more expire in the year 39 of the Christian era. From this time to the commencement of the Jewish war, false prophets and false Messiahs were continually starting up agreeably to the prophecy of our Lord.

But

But here the argument of Michaelis begins to press; and it may be asked, How could the Jews, consistently with their own principles, expect, from the *present* numbers in the prophecy of *the seventy weeks*, any manifestation of the Messiah after the year 39, when reckoning even from the *last* edict, if the permission in the twentieth year of Artaxerxes can be called *an edict*, the 483 years had expired? Yet, precisely about the time that the Jewish war broke out, indeed somewhat before that time (for, according to Josephus, it was the *cause* of the war's breaking out), the expectation of some great prince, who issuing forth from Judèa should conquer the whole world, was peculiarly rife.

To this it might be sufficient to answer, that the prejudices of some are so inveterate and deep-rooted as to bid defiance even to an arithmetical calculation. The Jews might still continue to hope even against hope; and might justify their expectations by charging the prophecy itself with darkness and ambiguity, as they clearly did, if we suppose *the ambiguous oracle* * alluded to by Josephus to be the prophecy of *the seventy weeks*—But I think a more definite reply may easily be given; I think it may be shewn, why immediately before the breaking out of the Jewish war they might be in

* Χρησμος αμφιβολος.

full

full expectation of the speedy appearance of the Messiah, deducing this very expectation from the numbers *exactly as they stand at present.* That the Jews were not the most accurate chronologers, the frequent and gross blunders of their great historian Josephus respecting the kings of Persia sufficiently testify. Let us suppose then, that, after the expiration of the year 39, when the 483 years reckoned from the 20th year of Artaxerxes terminated, the Jews, still disappointed in their expectation of the Messiah, begin to doubt, whether they have calculated them from the right era. *The Darius*, they might say, *who enacted the second decree, was not Darius Hystaspis, as we have hitherto erroneously supposed, but Darius Nothus: it is from the third year of* this *Darius, that we must reckon the* 483 *years.* In such a supposition I see nothing very improbable, since this error, gross as it doubtless is, has been sanctioned by names of no less respectability than those of Scaliger and Mede. Now the third year of Darius Nothus synchronizes with the year A. C. 421: consequently, if from this year we reckon 483 years, we shall be brought to the year 63 of the vulgar Christian era. But this was the precise time, about which, according to Josephus, Suetonius, and Tacitus, the Jews were in full expectation of the great prince who was to acquire the sovereignty of the world:

world: for, three years afterwards, in the May of the year 66, the spirit of resistance to the Romans broke out; and, early in the following year, the war, which is said to have been occasioned by this expectation, commenced in good earnest.

Thus it is manifest, even if we fully *allow* his premises, how inconclusive the argument of Michaelis is, and how little it tends to support the opinion that the numbers in *the prophecy of the seventy weeks*, as they stand in our common Hebrew bibles, are not genuine readings.

But I see not why we are bound to *allow* his premises. Whatever degree of *probability* there may be in the supposition that the χρησμος αμφιβολος of Josephus is *the prophecy of the seventy weeks*, I think it far from *certain* that such is the case. The oracle alluded to by the historian is said to contain a prediction that *out of Judèa should come an universal monarch:* nothing of the kind is mentioned in *the prophecy of the seventy weeks:* the correspondence therefore between them fails in the most material point. Hence we must look out for some other oracle which contains the prediction in question, if we wish to discover the prophecy intended by Josephus. Now exactly such a prediction seems to be contained in the prophecy delivered by Jacob respecting *Shiloh*. " The sceptre shall not depart " from Judah, nor a lawgiver from between his " feet,

" feet, until Shiloh come: and unto him shall be " the gathering of the peoples. Binding his fole " unto the vine, and his ass's colt unto the choice " vine, he washes his garments in wine, and his " clothes in the blood of grapes. His eyes shall " be red with wine, and his teeth white with milk*."
Without entering upon a regular discussion of the import of this prophecy, it is easy enough to see what expectations the Jews might derive from it. *A great conqueror* is here predicted: and it might easily be supposed, that *the acquisition of universal sovereignty* was ascribed to him in the words *unto him shall be the gathering of the peoples.* He is immediately connected with the tribe of *Judah:* and it is declared, that the sceptre should not depart from that tribe until he should come. Upon this the Jews might naturally argue, as follows. *The Romans have long been encroaching upon our independence, but they have not yet quite deprived us of our sceptre: nevertheless, their very encroachments shew, that the time of Shiloh must be at hand. Let us arise, and resist them. We shall be certain of success: for the sceptre is fated not to depart from Judah until Shiloh come; and as yet Shiloh is not come. Whenever he does come, our sceptre is destined to be resigned to* him, *not*

* Gen. xlix. 10, 11, 12.

to

to the Romans: *for unto* him *shall the gathering of the peoples be. The Romans are now preparing to wrest it from us: therefore the great conqueror must be on the point of coming to vindicate his own cause, to claim the sceptre due to him alone, to tread the winepress in his fury, to wash his garments in the blood of his enemies, to exalt his chosen people to be the first among the nations.* I pretend not positively to say, that *the ambiguous oracle* of Josephus *is* the prophecy respecting *Shiloh:* I only argue, that even the *premises* of Michaelis are by no means undeniably established. But, granting that the historian *did* allude to *the prophecy of the seventy weeks**, I have shewn, that no conclusion against the integrity of the present numerical readings can be drawn from the expectation of the speedy appearing of the Messiah that prevailed immediately before the breaking out of the Jewish war.

On these grounds I think the inference of Dr. Blayney, that the genuine *prophecy of the seventy weeks* authorized the expectation of a two-fold com-

* Whether he alluded to the prophecy of *the seventy weeks* or not, *this*, I think, is at least clear, that the expectation of the Messiah, which prevailed before and at the birth of Christ, and which likewise prevailed when John the Baptist began to preach, must have been built upon some attempts to calculate the numbers in this famous prediction.

ing

ing of the Messiah, and that on this account the Jews particularly expected his coming at two different times, to be altogether unwarrantable. And I moreover think, that he has neither established the readings which he would substitute for the present readings, nor has given a satisfactory interpretation of the prophecy even according to his own emendations.

2. Mr. Lancaster, like Dr. Blayney, conceives the edict of Cyrus to be the edict intended by Daniel; and therefore maintains, that *the seventy weeks* ought to be computed from the era of its going forth. His scheme however is so singular a one, and is replete with such strange difficulties, that few persons seem to have been inclined to adopt it.

He assumes as a principle, that *the seventy weeks* are to be estimated in the same manner as the Jews calculated their weeks of years. But every seventh year of each week was a sabbatical year, and every fiftieth year was the year of jubilee; after the expiration of which, he supposes that a new series of seven weeks began. This being the case, seventy such weeks would comprehend 420 working years, 70 sabbatical years, and 10 jubilee years; amounting in the whole to 500 years, which he conceives to be the true length of *the seventy weeks.*

The seventy years of the Babylonian captivity he necessarily allows to have expired in the first year of

of Cyrus*; but he maintains, that they likewise expired with the capture of Babylon. For this purpose, he insists upon it, that the scriptural first year of Cyrus coincides with the scriptural first year of Darius the Mede; the first year of *both* those princes *alike* commencing from the capture of Babylon. But Babylon was taken in the year of the Julian period 4176†. He concludes therefore, upon *his* principles, that the captivity commenced in the year 4106 of the same period. Now we are told by Jeremiah, that Jerusalem was finally taken by Nebuchadnezzar, and the temple destroyed, in the nineteenth year of his reign and in the eleventh year of Zedekiah‡. This Nebuchadnezzar is usually supposed to have been Nebuchadnezzar the son, the *Nabocolassar* of Ptolemy; but Mr. Lancaster maintains, that he was Nebuchadnezzar the father, the *Nabopollassar* of Ptolemy. The nineteenth year then of the *elder* Nebuchadnezzar he fixes to the year 4106 of the Julian period; and thus obtains 70 years for the Babylonian captivity, reckoning it to commence from the final desolation

* See Ezra i. 1.

† Mr. Lancaster says this, on the supposition that Babylon was taken in the spring of the year A. C. 538; in which opinion he follows Abp. Usher, and I believe him to be right in doing so.

‡ Jerem. lii. 1, 45, 12.

of

of the city and temple. Hence he is obliged to suppose, that the *Nebuchadnezzar* mentioned in the first chapter of Daniel is a different person from the *Nebuchadnezzar* mentioned in his second chapter; the one being the father who destroyed Jerusalem, the other being his son and successor.

The commandment to rebuild Jerusalem in *the prophecy of the seventy weeks* he asserts to be the same as *the commandment that came forth at the beginning of Daniel's supplications*:* whence he argues, since the vision was revealed to him in the first year of Darius the Mede†, since the first year of Darius the Mede was the first year of Cyrus, since the edict of Cyrus went forth in his first year, and since the commandment is here said to have gone forth at the beginning of Daniel's supplications, that *the commandment to rebuild Jerusalem* must be *the edict of Cyrus.*

Here then the question is, if *the seventy weeks* be reckoned from the first year of Cyrus (even allowing them to contain 500 years), how they can be made to reach to any part of the times of Christ? —Mr. Lancaster answers by first attempting to shew, that 570 years reckoned back from his supposed end of the Babylonian captivity were still accounted but *seventy weeks;* because the Israelites,

* Dan. ix. 23. † Dan. ix. 1.

having

having neglected to observe 70 sabbatical years, were punished by the desolate resting of their land during *the seventy years* of the captivity*: those seventy years therefore were reckoned as the sabbaths of the seventy preceding weeks, and thus the 500 years with these 70 years added to them were still reputed to be no more than *seventy weeks.* Hence he argues, that, if 570 years *before* the restoration of the Jews were accounted as only *seventy weeks,* 570 years *after* their restoration might be accounted as the same. He next shews from Maimonides, that the Jews discontinued their computation by weeks of years during the whole time of the Babylonian captivity, and that they did not resume it until the year that Ezra went up to Jerusalem, that is to say until the seventh year of Artaxerxes. This year he throws back more than five years; and places it in the year 4250 of the Julian period, instead of the year 4256. By such a process he extends the reign of Artaxerxes from 41 years, as it is laid down in the canon of Ptolemy, to something more than 46; throws back the whole reign of Xerxes more than 5 years; and, to bring matters even again, shortens the reign of Darius Hystaspis from 36 years to not quite 31 years. Having thus fixed the year in which Ezra went up

* 2 Chron. xxxvi. 21.

to

to Jerusalem to the year 4250 of the Julian period, he reckons from it 500 years, the supposed amount in the *first* instance of *the seventy weeks*, and is brought to the year 4750 of the same period, which falls out about three years and a half after the crucifixion. But, between the Julian year 4250 which he maintains to be the seventh year of Artaxerxes and the Julian year 4177 in which he maintains the Babylonian captivity to have expired, there are 73 years. These, added to the 500 years, produce 573 years: and these 573 years, which in a round sum he is willing to consider as only 570 years, he asserts to be equal to no more than *seventy weeks*, as he had previously attempted to shew that the 570 years before the restoration from Babylon were similarly equal to no more than *seventy weeks*. Thus he obtains what he conceives to be Daniel's great number of *seventy weeks*, which includes all the smaller numbers.

The separation of *the seven weeks* from *the sixty two weeks*, and therefore from *the sixty three* if *the last week* be added to *the sixty two weeks*, he accounts for in the following manner. *The seventy years* of the Babylonian captivity he supposes, as we have just seen, to be the seventy sabbatical years, which the children of Israel had neglected to observe, and which their land was therefore then suffered to enjoy in its desolation. Of these sab-

batical years, he attempts to shew from a numerical prophecy of Ezekiel *, that the whole house of Israel neglected to observe 63 years; and the house of Judah, after the captivity of the ten tribes, 7 years. In allusion to this circumstance, and for no other reason, he conceives *the seventy weeks* to have been similarly divided.

As for *the last week* of *the seventy*, he supposes it to commence with the baptism of our Lord by John, very soon after the Baptist began his ministry in the fifteenth year of Tiberius, and to terminate with the baptism of the centurion Cornelius and his family the first fruits of the Gentiles. But, since *the sixty nine weeks* expired with the baptism of our Lord, and since he was crucified three years and a half after his baptism, he was cut off after *the sixty two weeks* added to *the seven weeks*, and before *the seventieth week* had expired. In this manner therefore, by his one great sacrifice of himself, did he spiritually abolish the Levitical sacrifices in the middle of *the last week;* and thus, during *one week*, did he make firm a covenant with many, namely with many of the converted Jews, previous to the preaching of the Gospel to the Gentiles.

The latter part of the prophecy he of course

* Ezek. iv. 4, 5, 6.

refers

refers to the sacking of Jerusalem by the Romans *.

(1) This hypothesis was by the author in his day defended with no small degree of pertinacity: yet, objectionable as it may appear, Mr. Lancaster seems to have been a man of so much sound learning, that it ought not to be passed over altogether in silence.

It is not improbable, that the computation by weeks in this prophecy was adopted in allusion to the Levitical weeks of years, which the Jews were commanded to keep by sabbatical years and by jubilees: yet there does not seem to be any thing in the prophecy to warrant the assumption, that these weeks must *necessarily* be computed as Mr. Lancaster supposes the Levitical weeks of years to have been †. It is dangerous to lay the very foundation of an hypothesis on a matter which is *itself* disputed. Different opinions have been entertained

* Chronological Essay on the seventy weeks.

† Though Dr. Prideaux argues, that the years of *the seventy weeks* must be solar years because the years of the Levitical weeks were evidently such, he roundly denies them to have any other connection. "The prophecy," says he, "means "no more, than by *the seventy weeks* to express 70 times 7 "years, that is 490 in the whole, without any relation had "either to *Shemittahs* or sabbatical years." Preface to Connection.

respecting

respecting the precept that enjoins the observation of the jubilee. Some maintain, that it was observed in the fiftieth year agreeably to the express words of Moses *; and that, when fifty years had expired, another series of seven weeks commenced, terminating in a similar manner with another jubilee in the fiftieth year. This opinion, which would make seventy such weeks equivalent to 500 years, is followed by Mr. Lancaster. Others maintain, that the fiftieth year of the jubilee must coincide with the forty ninth year or the seventh sabbatical year; and urge in favour of their supposition, that, since Moses declares seven weeks to be no more than forty nine years †, since by interposing a fiftieth year the series of regular weeks as corresponding with weeks of days is completely broken, and since intolerable inconvenience would result from the land remaining untilled during two successive years, the jubilee must have been observed in the forty ninth year which is called *the fiftieth* only from its being twice mentioned. This opinion, which would make seventy such weeks equivalent to 490 years, is followed (not to notice other names) by Abp. Usher. The question then is, which of these two opinions is the right one. I certainly incline to assent to the latter, though I think the mode of

* Levit. xxv. 10, 11. † Levit. xxv. 8.

stating it to be not a little objectionable. We are so expressly told, that the jubilee was observed in the fiftieth year, that it is difficult to conceive how it could ever have been celebrated in the forty ninth: yet, if it were observed in an *interposed* fiftieth year, it is manifest, both that the series of regular weeks would be broken, and that seven weeks would contain fifty years, whereas Moses assures us that they contained no more than forty nine. The truth of the matter therefore I take to be, that the jubilee was observed indeed in the fiftieth year; but that this jubilee year was reckoned also as the first year of the new series of seven weeks. Such a supposition appears to me to be the only one that can satisfactorily reconcile Moses with himself: for it at once makes each jubilee be punctually observed in the fiftieth year, and yet ascribes no more than forty nine precise years to seven weeks. But, however this may be, since Maimonides tells us, that, after the return from the captivity, the Jews only observed the sabbatical years, and not the jubilees*; and since the same may be collected from Josephus, who informs us that Alexander remitted to the Jews their tribute every seventh year on account of its being sabbatical†: we may apparently infer, that,

* Calmet's Dict. Vox *Jubilee*—Preface to Prideaux's Connection.

† Joseph. Ant. Jud. lib. xi. cap. 8. § 5.

in

in whatever manner the jubilee might have been *previously* kept, seventy Levitical weeks *subsequent* to the time of Ezra, when the observation of the jubilee was *discontinued,* could have amounted to no more than 490 years. Thus does Mr. Lancaster's system halt at its very commencement.

(2.) His arrangement of *the seventy years* of the Babylonian captivity is no less objectionable. The whole context of the book of Daniel shews it to be impossible that the scriptural first year of Cyrus should be the same as the scriptural first year of Darius the Mede. Such a supposition both makes the prophet use two different modes of reckoning, thereby introducing the most wanton and needless confusion; and makes him employ language altogether inexplicable and unaccountable. When he says, *This Daniel prospered in the reign of Darius, and in the reign of Cyrus the Persian,* two *successive* reigns must plainly be meant. Had he designed, that we should understand him as speaking of a *joint* reign, he would obviously have said, *in the reign of Darius and Cyrus;* as *we* say, *in the reign of William and Mary,* not *in the reign of Mary and in the reign of William the Hollander.* Such being the case, even if the edict to rebuild Jerusalem mentioned in the prophecy *be* the edict of Cyrus, it cannot be the same as the commandment which is said to have gone forth at the beginning of Da-

niel's supplications, because those supplications were offered up in the first year of Darius, whereas the edict was enacted in the first year of Cyrus. Hence, with Dr. Blayney and the generality of commentators, I think it manifest, that *the commandment* means only *God's commandment to the angel to reveal the vision of Daniel;* and that, as a special reward of his faith and piety, it went forth ere he had well begun to pray. Such, from the context seems to be the natural import of the passage *.

But let us concede to Mr. Lancaster, that the first year of Cyrus is the same as the first year of Darius, and observe the consequences of it—1. From this supposed first year of Cyrus he counts back seventy years, in order to arrive at the nineteenth year of Ptolemy's *Nabopollassar* or Nebu-

* " If it be asked, To what do I suppose *the commandment*, " ver. 23, to refer? I answer, that with the generality of in- " terpreters I understand no other by it, than a commission " given by God to go and shew Daniel all the following par- " ticulars, as a mark of God's special favour: and this I con- " ceive to be the most natural import of the words taken to- " gether, *At the beginning of thy supplications an order came* " *forth, in pursuance of which I am come to shew thee, because* " *thou art greatly beloved of God; therefore attend to the order,* " *and consider the vision* or *revelation:* that is, *understand by* " *whose authority I come, and consider the import of what is now* " *revealed to thee.*" Dr. Blayney's Dissert. p. 25, 26.

chadnezzar

chadnezzar the father; and thence maintains, that it was in the nineteenth year of *Nebuchadnezzar the father*, and not in the nineteenth year of *Nebuchadnezzar the son*, that Jerusalem and the temple were destroyed. Now, since Nabopollassar reigned 21 years; since his son reigned two years conjointly with him; since Jerusalem and the temple were destroyed in the eleventh year of Zedekiah, and in the nineteenth year of *some* Nebuchadnezzar; and since Mr. Lancaster ascribes their destruction, not to Ptolemy's *Nabocolassar* as other chronologers do, but to his father *Nabopollassar*: it is plain, that he throws back the eleventh year of Zedekiah and the final destruction of Jerusalem by the scriptural Nebuchadnezzar no less than 19 years: for, *Nebuchadnezzar the son* having reigned two years with his father, his nineteenth year according to Jeremiah's account coincides with his seventeenth year according to Ptolemy's account—2. Such being the case, since the years of all the kings both of Judah and Israel are given us in Scripture; since their synchronization with the different kings of Assyria is likewise marked; since we know that the reign of Tiglath Pileser commenced synchronically with the reign of Nabonassar, because they both began to reign upon the overthrow of the first Assyrian empire*; and since this Tiglath Pileser, *early* in

* See Usser. Annal. in A. P. J. 3966, 3967.

the

the reign of Ahaz, assisted him against Rezin and Pekah: it will necessarily follow, that to throw back the eleventh year of Zedekiah 19 years will render it utterly impossible for Tiglath Pileser, whose reign commenced in the first year of the era of Nabonassar, to have been contemporary with Ahaz more than about a year, and that year *the last* of Ahaz. For to throw back the eleventh year of Zedekiah 19 years must proportionably throw back the reigns of all the other kings both of Judah and Israel. Consequently the death of Ahaz must be thrown back from the beginning of the twenty first year of the era of Nabonassar to the beginning of the second year of that era; that is to say, to the beginning of the second year of Nabonassar at Babylon and of Tiglath Pileser at Nineveh. But Ahaz reigned about 16 years: and Tiglath Pileser assisted him at the *beginning* of his reign over Judah, and died shortly after his *twelfth* year*. It is plain therefore that a scheme of chronology, which makes Ahaz *die* in the second year of Tiglath Pileser, instead of *surviving* him and being partly contemporary with his son Salmaneser, must be grossly erroneous—3. The incongruity of this system will further appear from another circumstance. Zecha-

* Compare 2 Kings xv. 36, 37, 38—xvi. 1—10. xvii. 1, 2, 3. and see Usser. Annal. in A. P. J. 3972—3987. and the chronological tables at the end of Prideaux's Connection.

riah

riah tells us, that in the fourth year of Darius the Jews had kept the fasts of the fifth and seventh months seventy years *. But these fasts, as it is well known, were instituted on account of the destruction of the temple and the murder of Gedaliah in the nineteenth year of Nebuchadnezzar. Therefore there must be a period of seventy years between the nineteenth of that Nebuchadnezzar who destroyed the temple, and the fourth of Darius Hystaspis. Now there are exactly 70 years between the fourth of Darius and the nineteenth of *Nebuchadnezzar the son* or Nabocolassar, inasmuch as the nineteenth year of that prince according to Jeremiah's reckoning (who computes from the beginning of his two years joint reign with his father) answers to his seventeenth year in the canon of Ptolemy: whereas between the fourth of Darius and the nineteenth of *Nebuchadnezzar the father* or Nabopollassar, which (according to Mr. Lancaster) coincides with the eleventh of Zedekiah, there are 89 years †. Hence it is evident, that the temple was destroyed in the nineteenth year of *Nebuchadnezzar the son*, not in the nineteenth of *Nebuchadnezzar the father* ‡—4. There is yet another matter,

* Zechar. vii. 1, 5.

† See the Canon of Ptolemy in the Appendix.

‡ Mr. Lancaster indeed would persuade us, that in the fourth year of Darius the Jews had not fasted and mourned *during*

matter, which no less decidedly proves the erroneousness of Mr. Lancaster's opinion. The thirty seventh year of the captivity of Jehoiachin expires with the commencement of the first year of Evil-Merodach*; and he was led away captive at the commencement of the first year of Zedekiah†: therefore the eleventh year of Zedekiah must have been the eleventh year of his captivity. But the first year of Evil-Merodach or Elyarodamus is fixed by the canon of Ptolemy to the year 187 of the era of Nabonassar. This year then commencing (as it does) with the close of the thirty seventh of Jehoiachin's captivity, the eleventh year of his captivity, and consequently the eleventh year of Zedekiah, must have coincided with the year 160 of the same era. But this year coincides with the year 4126 of the Julian period: and the Julian year 4126 coin-

during the space of seventy years, but that they had then only long fasted and mourned *on account of* the seventy years, namely *the seventy years of the captivity*. There is no word however in the original to correspond with *on account of*, nor will it bear any such unnatural gloss. Mr. Lancaster indeed carefully avoids introducing the expression *on account of;* and only paraphrases the passage *when ye fasted and mourned even those seventy years*, in the same sense as we sometimes speak elliptically of *a person's mourning his misfortunes:* but the sense is still the same.

* See 2 Kings xxv. 27. and Jerem. lii. 31.

† See 2 Kings xxiv. 10—17.

cides

cides with Ptolemy's seventeenth year of Nabocolassar or *Nebuchadnezzar the son*, which is the same as the nineteenth year of that prince according to Jeremiah's reckoning. Now the temple was destroyed in the eleventh year of Zedekiah: and this eleventh year of Zedekiah had been shewn to coincide with the nineteenth year of *Nebuchadnezzar the son*. Therefore it is again evident, that *Nebuchadnezzar the son*, not *Nebuchadnezzar the father*, was the prince who destroyed the temple* —5. Nor is this all. Mr. Lancaster *doubly* errs in his chronology. I have hitherto spoken of his throwing back the eleventh year of Zedekiah *nineteen* years, because he professes to throw it back to the nineteenth year of Nabopollassar; but in

* Mr. Lancaster attempts to get rid of this chronological difficulty, by conjecturing, that Evil-Merodach was called to the throne during the seven years madness of his father, that this madness commenced at the close of the 37th year of Jehoiachin's captivity, and that the first year of Evil-Merodach was *the first of his reign during the madness of his father* not *the first of his reign after the death of his father*. All this however is mere conjecture; for it is not positively known, in *what* part of the reign of Nebuchadnezzar his madness ought to be placed, nor whether the government were during that time vested in Evil-Merodach. It is conjecture moreover, not only unsupported, but directly contradicted by Josephus, who asserts that the first year of Evil-Merodach, in which he released Jehoiachin, was his first year *after* the death of his father. Ant. Jud. lib, x, cap. 11. § 2.

reality

reality he throws it back *twenty* years, because he places this nineteenth year of Nabopollassar in the year 4106 of the Julian period. His reason for such an arrangement is, that he may have exactly 70 years between his raised eleventh year of Zedekiah and the capture of Babylon in the year 4176 of the same period. But, as if this scheme were doomed to fail in all its parts, the nineteenth year of Nabopollassar, according to the canon of Ptolemy, does *not* coincide with the Julian year 4106, but with the Julian year 4107 *.

(3.) Faulty however as his arrangement of *the seventy years* and the first year of Cyrus is, it is not so inseparably connected with his arrangement of *the seventy weeks* as necessarily to involve the faultiness of *that* also. I proceed now therefore to discuss the latter.

Maimonides informs us, that the Jews did not resume their computation by weeks of years, which was discontinued at the commencement of the Babylonian captivity, until the year that Ezra went up to Jerusalem, that is, until the seventh year of Artaxerxes. Mr. Lancaster, who contends that *the seventy weeks* of the prophecy exactly coincide with

* Mr. Lancaster's scheme of raising the eleventh year of Zedekiah twenty years is confuted very ably and at a considerable length by Mr. Marshall in his treatise on the seventy weeks.

seventy of these weeks of years, that the *actual** commencement of *the seventy weeks* synchronizes with the resumption of the Levitical mode of computation, and that seventy Levitical weeks are equivalent to 500 years, finds it necessary for his scheme to lengthen the reign of Artaxerxes, to curtail the reign of Darius Hystaspis, and to throw back the whole reign of Xerxes, something more than 5 years. This curtailment of the reign of Darius is made on the authority of Ctesias, who asserts that he reigned only 31 years, therein contradicting Herodotus who assigns 36 years to his reign. The question therefore is, which of the two writers we are to follow. Now it is positively known, that the battle of Marathon was fought either in the thirty first year of Darius, the year in which Mr. Lancaster supposes him to die, or in his thirty second year: of these the latter opinion, which fixes it to the year 4224 of the Julian period, seems to be the true one. It is also known that it was fought four years before the death of Darius, in the tenth year before the transit of Xerxes, and exactly ten years before he lost the battle of Salamis †. It is lastly known, that

* I say *actual*, because here he makes them commence after the expiration of the 73 additional years.

† " Parta est celeberrima hæc victoria, Boëdromionis (tertii " a solstitio æstivo mensis Attici) die 6to, ut in Camillo refert " Plutarchus;

that the battle of Salamis was fought in the sixth year of Xerxes *. But these different particulars cannot all be true according to Mr. Lancaster's proposed chronological arrangement. For, by supposing that the battle of Marathon was fought in the year 4223 of the Julian period and in the thirty first year of Darius, and by yet maintaining that Darius reigned no more than 31 years, he allows no greater interval between the battle of Marathon and the battle of Salamis than 6 years; and, instead of placing the former of these 4 years before the death of Darius, he places it in the very year in which he died. Thus, even to say nothing of his *double* contradiction of Ptolemy †, I think it evident, that his dislocation of chronology in the present instance is no less unwarrantable than in that

" Plutarchus; Phanippo Athenis archonte, ut in Aristide ha-
" bet idem: lxxii dæ videlicet Olympiadis anno 3io, quadri-
" ennis ante mortem Darii, ut in libro 2do sacræ historiæ Se-
" verus Sulpicius indicat; anno ante Xerxis in Græciam tran-
" situm 10mo, ut in 1mo historiæ suæ habet Thucydides, et
" in Corinthiacorum auxiliatorum epitaphio Lysias; et ante
" pugnam Salaminiam, eodem mense Boëdromione factam,
" 10 annis completis, ut apud Platonem libro 3tio de legimus
" invenimus." Usser. Annal. in A. P. J. 4224.

* See Usser. Annal. in A. P. J. 4233, 4234.

† Ptolemy assigns 36 years to Darius, and 41 to Artaxerxes: Mr. Lancaster, only 31 years to Darius, and 46 to Artaxerxes.

which

which was last considered; and that the seventh year of Artaxerxes ought to be placed in the year 4256 of the Julian period, where Ptolemy's numbers shew it ought to be placed, not in the year 4250, where Mr. Lancaster places it*.

(4.) But, even if he had succeeded better than he *has* done in his chronological arrangements, the question would still be, how far we can reasonably admit 573 years, the period between his supposed first year of Cyrus and the fourth year from the crucifixion, to be equal to the prophetic term of *seventy weeks*. Mr. Lancaster argues, that, as a period of 570 years *before* the expiration of the Babylonian captivity was estimated as no more than seventy weeks; so a period of 573 years, which may be called in a round number 570 years, may be estimated *after* the Babylonian captivity as *similarly* being no more than seventy weeks. It is to be feared however, that the very *basis* of his argument

* To this direct proof it may be added, that the authority of Ctesias, on which Mr. Lancaster builds, has never been held in very high repute; whence it is not reasonable to expect, that we should set aside the canon of Ptolemy and the testimony of Herodotus in his favour. "We find," says Dr. Prideaux, "but a poor character of him among the ancients "(Aristot. Hist. Animal. lib. viii. c. 28—Plutarch. in Ar-"taxerx.), they generally speaking of him as a fabulous writer." Connect. Part i. B. vii. p. 452.

is by no means well established*: but, if it *had* been established with the most overbearing evidence, it would not therefore have warranted the *inference* which he has drawn from it. The Israelites, Mr. Lancaster maintains, during seventy weeks *before* the Babylonian captivity, neglected to observe the seventy sabbatical years belonging to those weeks. *The seventy years* therefore of the captivity, during which the land rested, were reckoned *in lieu* of the neglected seventy sabbatical years: and the seventy weeks *with the addition* of the seventy years of the captivity, amounting in the whole to 570 years, were *still* estimated as no more than seventy weeks. Now, granting for a moment the accuracy of this statement which may very well be disputed, I see not what right he has thence to infer, that 573 years *after* the captivity, or 570 years as he wishes to call them in a round number, are similarly equal to no more than seventy weeks. The same *cause* does not exist for the *one* reckoning, that exists, according to Mr. Lancaster's theory, for the *other*. Whether the Israelites *neglected* to observe the seventy sabbatical years of the same number of weeks *before* the captivity, or *not;* they certainly, as we have seen above both from Jose-

* This is so fully shewn by Mr. Marshall, that it would be superfluous for me here to discuss the matter afresh.

phus

phus and Maimonides, *duly* observed the sabbatical years *after* the captivity from the days of Ezra, who revived the ordinance of the Levitical weeks, down to the very time of Christ. Hence we plainly cannot be warranted in adding 73 years to the 500 years; which, according to Mr. Lancaster, elapsed between the first year of Artaxerxes and the fourth year after the crucifixion, and which he maintains to be equal to seventy Levitical weeks when the sabbatical years of those weeks are *regularly observed.* *All* the sabbatical years of *the seventy weeks* of the prophecy were, by *his own* account, *regularly observed;* and seventy Levitical weeks, when their sabbatical years *are* regularly observed, are, by *his own* account also, equal to 500 years. Such being the case, *the seventy weeks* of the prophecy cannot with any shew of reason be extended to 573 years. I may add to this, that, since Maimonides tells us that after the return from the captivity the Jews never observed the jubilee years, seventy weeks in *this* case, however the jubilees might have been *formerly* celebrated, could only have been equal to 490 years, not to 500 years as Mr. Lancaster asserts *.

* The reader will find the whole hypothesis of Mr. Lancaster confuted at large by Mr. Marshall in his *treatise on the seventy weeks.* To that work I beg to refer him, if he should wish to investigate the matter any further.

(5.) After

(5.) After pointing out the preceding objections to Mr. Lancaster's scheme, it may seem almost superfluous to notice his placing *the cutting off of the Messiah* (if the original be so translated) in the middle of *the seventieth week*, instead of at the end of *the sixty ninth*, which the express language of the prophecy necessarily requires*; and his violently separating the abolition of the sacrifice from the times of the siege of Jerusalem, to which the context so plainly binds it. Enough, I trust, has been said to shew that it is utterly untenable †.

Having

* " And after threescore and two weeks (added to the " above-mentioned seven weeks) shall Messiah be cut off." Dan. ix. 26.

† Mr. Bennett, a Polish Jew, in a work recently published by him under the title of *The constancy of Israel*, has brought forward a discussion of the prophecy of *the seventy weeks;* in which it is difficult to say, whether the chronology, the translation of the original, or the application of the prediction, is the most extraordinary.

1. He allows the greater period to mean 490 years: but these years he computes from the beginning of Zedekiah's captivity to the commencement of the reign of Herod. The *seven weeks* or 49 years he reckons from the same era, and makes them terminate with the first year of Cyrus, whom he supposes to be *the anointed prince* or (as he thinks proper to translate the original) *the exalted prince.* The remaining *sixty three weeks* are the period of Judah's existence from the restoration by Cyrus to the commencement of the reign of Herod; whereof *sixty two weeks* are his existence in a state of sovereignty, and *one week* his existence in a state of confusion.

On

Having thus prepared the way by discussing the nature of the ancient Jewish year, the chronology of

On this arrangement it may be remarked, that, according to the astronomical canon of Ptolemy, the 11th year of Zedekiah, coinciding with the 17th year of Nebuchadnezzar (which answers to his 19th year as Jeremiah reckons the years of his reign), must have coincided with A. Æ. N. 160 and A. P. J. 4126: and the first year of Herod, coinciding with Ptolemy's 15th year of Cleopatra, must have coincided with A. Æ. N. 711 and A. P. J. 4677. Hence it is manifest, that, instead of 490 years (as Mr. Bennett informs us), there are no less than 551 years between his supposed commencement and his supposed termination of *the seventy weeks*—So again: the 11th year of Zedekiah coinciding with A. Æ. N. 160 and A. P. J. 4126, and the scriptural 1st year of Cyrus (his 3d according to Ptolemy, who ascribes to Cyrus the two years of Darius) coinciding with A. Æ. N. 212 and A. P. J. 4178, it is plain that between these two eras there is a period of 52 years: Mr. Bennett teaches us, that there are 49 years only—The unaccountable erroneousness of his arrangement of *the seventy weeks* of course involves the erroneousness of *the sixty three weeks.*

2. Had the chronology been less exceptionable, it might still be demanded, on what authority are *the seventy weeks* reckoned from the beginning of Zedekiah's captivity? I can discover nothing but the *ipse dixit* of Mr. Bennett. As for the prophecy itself, it tells us to compute the first period of *the seventy weeks* and therefore *the seventy weeks* themselves, *from the going forth of an edict to rebuild Jerusalem.* This would have impeded Mr. Bennett's progress, had he not discovered that מן מצא דבר, the literal version of which is *from the going of a word,* ought to be translated *in the conclusion.* How such a version can be elicited from the Hebrew original, I am at a

loss to comprehend. Some of his other versions are little less singular. In ver. 26, he translates משיח *the regency;* he had previously rendered it *exalted;* the word, as it frequently occurs in Scripture, means *the anointed one;* not *a thing*, but *a person.* In the same verse he translates ישחית *shall be subdued*, and tells us that its root is שחה. He has been led into this error by observing the letter ת in ישחית and the same letter ת in שחותי (Psalm xxxviii. 6.), whence he imagines that they spring from the same root. He ought to have known, that the ת in שחותי is a servile and a portion of the pronominal suffix תי: whereas the ת in ישחית is a radical. The two words, which he would make one and the same, are two perfectly distinct words and of entirely different meanings. In the same verse he translates וקצו *and his grief*, instead of *and the end thereof:* but, what idea we are to annex to the whole clause *and his grief shall be with a flood*, he does not inform us.

3. After what has been said, it is almost superfluous to add any thing respecting his application of the prophecy. If *the Messiah* here spoken of mean *Cyrus*, it may be asked, from what text in the whole bible do the Jews derive their practice of calling their expected deliverer *the Messiah?* Wherever the term *elsewhere* occurs, we are not required *by the necessity of the place* to apply it to the promised Saviour. Their ancestors certainly understood *the Messiah* of Daniel in a very different sense from that which Mr. Bennett recommends to us. They were in full expectation of their great deliverer *both before and after the ministry of Jesus.* Why should they have expected him *about that precise time*, if they had not computed *the seventy weeks* from one or other of the Persian edicts? But, if their expectation was built on such a computation, then they must have

proposed, I may now proceed to an examination of the prophecy itself.

have looked for their Messiah in *the Messiah* of Daniel. Mr. Bennett not only contradicts the sense of the ancient Jews, but likewise of many of the Jewish commentators. Barnahaman, Moses Gerundensis, the Talmudists, the Rabbins, the Hebrews of Jerome's time, all understood this prophecy as relating to the expected Messiah—He makes both *the sixty nine weeks* and *the seventy weeks* end with the beginning of Herod's reign, and says, that they alike expired when Judèa was made a Roman province. *Both* these periods could not expire at the same time: and, as for Judèa, it was not made a Roman province until after the 10th year of Archelaus, that is to say, full 44 years after the beginning of Herod's reign—How *the one week* applies to any part of Herod's reign, Mr. Bennett does not think proper to inform us: he satisfies *himself* at least with telling us, in general terms, that from *the sixty second week* Judèa will be in a state of confusion as it is explained in the 26th and 27th verses.

More might be said: but I am weary of the subject. This work certainly would not have been noticed by me, had it not shewn in a strong light the wretched shifts to which the Jews are obliged to have recourse.

CHAPTER IV.

Concerning the proper translation of the prophecy.

BEFORE any attempt can be made to explain the prophecy of *the seventy weeks*, it will be necessary to inquire into the proper mode of translating it.

The prediction itself, I conceive, ought to be read and translated in the following manner.

Dan. IX.

Ver. 24.

שבעים שבעים נחתך על עמך
ועל עיר קדשך לכלה הפשע ולהתם
חטאות ולכפר עון ולהביא צדק
עלמים ולחתם חזון ונביא ולמשח
קדש קדשים :

Ver. 24.

Weeks seventy *are* the precise period upon thy people and upon thy holy city, to complete the apostasy, and to perfect the sin-offerings, and to make atonement for iniquity, and to cause *him who is* the righteousness of the eternal ages to come, and to seal the vision and the prophet, and to anoint the Most Holy One.

Ver.

Ver. 25.

ותדע ותשכל מן מצא דבר להשיב
ולבנות ירושלם עד משיח נגיד
שבעים שבעה ושבעים ששים
ושנים תשוב ונבנתה רחוב וחרוץ
ובצוק העתים׃

Ver. 25.

But know and understand, from the going forth of an edict to rebuild Jerusalem unto the Anointed One the Prince *shall be* weeks seven and weeks sixty and two: it shall be rebuilt, with perpetual increase and firm decision, even in the short space of the times.

Ver. 26.

ואחרי השבעים שבעה והשבעים
ששים ושנים יכרת משיח ואין לו
והעיר והקדש׃

Ver. 26.

And, after the weeks seven and the weeks sixty and two, the Anointed One shall cut off by divorce, so that *they shall be* no more his, both the city and the sanctuary.

ישחית עם נגיד הבא וקצו
בשטף ועד קץ מלחמה נחרצת
שממות׃

For the people of the Prince that shall come shall act corruptly: but the end thereof *shall be* with a flood; and unto the end of a war firmly decided upon *shall be* desolations.

Ver. 27.

והגביר ברית לרבים שבוע
אחד׃
וחצי השבוע ישבית זבח ומנחה
ועל כנף שקוץ משמם ועד כלה
ונחרצה תתך על שומם׃

Ver. 27.

Yet he shall make firm a covenant with many for one week.

And in half a week he shall cause the sacrifice and meat-offering to cease (for upon the border *shall be* the abomination that maketh desolate), even until an utter end, and that firmly decided upon, shall be poured upon the desolator.

I. In this arrangement of the original prediction, only four readings, different from those which stand in our common Hebrew Bibles, have been adopted; and for every one of these the most ample authority may be produced.

1. For לכלא in the 24th verse *to restrain*, I read לכלה *to finish* in the sense of *completing*, considering it as used irregularly instead of לכלות. I am supported by thirty or forty manuscripts, the old versions, our present English translation, and the Polyglotts and Hexaplars.

2. For ולחתם in the same verse *and to seal*, I read ולהתם *and to perfect*. This is the reading of the *Keri*, and of a great number of manuscripts: and it is followed by the Vulgate, the Syriac, and our English version, though they understand it in the sense of *making an end of*; which, if taken spiritually, will in effect be the same sense as that which I ascribe to it.

3. For *after weeks sixty and two* in the 26th verse, I read *after weeks seven and weeks sixty and two*. This is one of the very few instances, in which even a *conjectural* emendation might have been allowable, because it is plainly required by the context: for, if there were to be seven weeks and sixty two weeks *unto the Messiah*, as we are told in the preceding verse, he plainly could neither *act* nor *suffer*, whether the word יכרת be translated actively

actively or passively, at least in his official character, before the expiration of sixty nine weeks. Accordingly, most commentators have supposed *the sixty two weeks*, mentioned unconnectedly in the 26th verse, to be *sixty two weeks after seven weeks*. But happily we have no occasion to resort to conjecture: the complete reading of the 26th verse, perfectly according with that of the 25th, has been preserved in the Greek version of Aquila and in the Arabic; the first of which reads *after the seven weeks and sixty and two* *, and the second somewhat more fully *after the seven weeks and the sixty and two weeks* †.

4. For שקוצים *abominations* in the 27th verse, the royal Parisian manuscript reads singularly שיקוץ *the abomination*. The word is likewise given singularly in the Vulgate, the Syriac, the Arabic, and the Greek of Theodotion ‡. To which may be added, what seems sufficiently to decide the genuineness of the reading, that our Lord, according both to Matthew and Mark, cites it singularly §.

On such authorities, the proposed readings may, I think, be safely adopted.

* Μετα τας ἑπτα ἑβδομαδας και ἑξηκονθα δυο.

† "Post septem hebdomades et sexaginta duas hebdomades."

‡ The version that generally bears the name of the LXX.

§ Matt. xxiv. 15—Mark xiii. 14.

II. The

II. The variations from our common English version, which occur in the present translation of the prophecy, shall next be examined.

1. I consider the word נחתך, in the 24th verse, as a participial noun. Although the root חתך occurs only once in the whole Bible, there seems little reason to doubt that its primitive meaning is *to cut*. Now I have already shewn, that the period, mentioned in the 24th verse, must be understood to look *prospectively*, and not, as Dr. Blayney supposes, *retrospectively*. Such being the case, the import of נחתך cannot be *cutting off*, in the sense of *terminating*. Since the period connected with it looks *prospectively*, the most natural and obvious idea that can be affixed to it is that of *precision* and *definiteness*. Every limited period is *cut out* from the lapse of time in general; and thus, instead of being *unlimited*, it becomes *fixed* and *precise*. This sense of the word has been adopted by two of the Hexaplar versions; one of which renders it εδοκιμασθησαν *have been approved* or *estimated*, and another εκριθησαν *have been decreed*. It has also been adopted by our common English translation and Mr. Wintle. And I am inclined to think, that the συνετμηθησαν of Theodotion, though it probably was the prototype of the Vulgate *abbreviatæ sunt*, was designed to convey much the same meaning, that

that of *cutting out together the whole specified period from time in general**.

2. I render לכלה *to complete*, that is to say, *to finish a matter in the sense of completing it.* The

* Mr. Godwin translates it *cut out*, and assigns as a reason *because they numbered by cutting notches.* I can more easily admit the propriety of his version, than of the reason on which it is founded.

Mr. Mede, who like myself thinks that the whole prophecy of *the seventy weeks* will not be finally accomplished until the expiration of Daniel's *three times and a half*, understands the word much in the same manner that I do. "The word נחתך, "here translated *determined* or *allotted*, signifies properly *to be* "*cut*, or *cut out*, and so may seem to imply such a sense as if "the angel had said to Daniel, Howsoever your bondage and "captivity under the Gentiles shall not altogether cease, until "that succession of kingdoms which I before shewed thee be "quite finished; yet shall God, for the accomplishing his pro-"mise concerning the Messiah, as it were *cut out* of that long "term a certain limited time, during which the captivity of "Judah and Jerusalem being interrupted, the holy city and "commonwealth in some measure shall again be restored, and "so continue till seventy weeks of years be finished." Works. b. iii. p. 697.

Professor Michaelis constructs and understands the word almost exactly in the same manner as myself. "Grammatico "tamen fortè præplacuerit, ad vitandam anomaliam verbi "singularis cum *septuaginta hebdomades* constructi, puncta "mutare, נֶחְתָּךְ, et *decisum*, *fatum*, vertere; *septuaginta heb-*"*domades decretum sunt Dei super populum tuum.*" Supplem. ad Lex. Heb. Vox. חתך.

word

word is thus understood in the Vulgate Latin *. It is understood in the same manner by Africanus †, Tertullian, Theodoret, Chrysostom ‡, and the Jewish expositors §. And the terms, used by Theodotion || and Aquila ¶ in their translations, do not forbid the supposition, that such likewise was the idea which *they* annexed to it.

3. The word פֶּשַׁע, which in our English translation is rendered *transgression*, does not mean *transgression in general* of any description, but *a revolt with a high hand from the person to whom obedience is due as a sovereign.* When that sovereign therefore is God, and the revolt is taken in a religious sense, it is equivalent to *a determined apos-*

* " Ut consummetur prævaricatio."

† " Postquam consummata sunt delicta." Afric. apud Hieron. Comment. in Dan. in loc.

‡ " Sensus est primo, q. d. *Donec impietas ad summum cres-*
" *cat, ita ut amplius augeri nequeat, donec scilicet occidatur*
" *Christus noster, quod summum fuit peccatum.* Unde Tertull.
" lib. contra Judæos legit, *quoadusque inveteretur delictum.* Ita
" Theodor. Euseb. l. 8. Demons. et S. Chrysost. orat. 2. con-
" tra Judæos. Sic medicus expectat crisin morbi, ut is totum
" se exserat, crescatque ad summum; tumque curationem in-
" cipit, cum morbus planè cognitus decrescere incipit." Cornel. a Lapid. Comment. in Dan. in loc.

§ " Judæi vertunt *ut perficiatur*, vel *ut consummetur*, vel *ad*
" *summum perducatur.*" Poli. Synop. in loc.

|| Συντελεσθηναι. ¶ Τελεσαι.

tasy:

tasy: which apostasy may go on increasing from bad to worse, until at length by some peculiarly daring act of rebellion it is *consummated,* being then incapable of receiving any addition to its atrocity.

4. The word חטאה, as it is well known, signifies *a sin-offering,* as well as *sin* itself, from the circumstance of the sins of the sacrificer being, under the Levitical dispensation, imputatively transferred to the victim which he sacrificed. In this sense I understand חטאות as it occurs in the present passage.

5. In the 25th verse, the literal translation of the original להשיב ולבנות ירושלם is *to bring back and to build Jerusalem,* which is an Hebraism equivalent to the single expression *to rebuild Jerusalem.*

6. The latter end of the 25th verse is rendered in our common English version, *the street shall be built again and the wall even in troublous times.* " To this translation," as Dr. Blayney observes, " the following objections occur. First, that the " verbs תשוב ונבנתה, being both feminine, can- " not by rules of grammar be constructed with the " following nouns; which are masculine. But, " granting that this objection might be got over by " making *Jerusalem* the subject of the verbs, and " the nouns *street* and *wall* to be used in apposi- " tion;

" tion; it may next be questioned by what autho-
" rity the word חרוץ is interpreted to signify *a*
" *wall.* In this sense it is certainly used no where
" else; and I think it will be found difficult to ac-
" count for, how any such meaning can be deduced
" from its root or from any term of affinity with
" it*." The passage is undoubtedly obscure; yet, I trust, not so incapable of elucidation as Michaelis represents it †. Though I give a somewhat different version of it from that of Dr. Blayney, yet it appears to me, as it previously did to him, that the fundamental error in our common translation is the considering the two words רחוב and חרוץ as *substantives*, instead of *verbs in the infinitive mood taken gerundively.* The word רחב signifies *to be enlarged:* its infinitive רחוב therefore, used gerundively, will signify *with enlarging itself* or *with continual enlargement.* The other verb חרץ signifies primarily *to cut short*, whence it acquires the metaphorical sense of *deciding* or *determining:* its infinitive חרוץ therefore, used in a similar manner gerundively, will signify *with firm deciding* or *with*

* Dr. Blayney's Dissert. on the seventy weeks. p. 36, 37.

† " The professor Michaelis owns himself totally at a loss,
" and unable to satisfy himself with his own or any other con-
" jectures about the true sense of these words," namely רחוב and חרוץ. Dr. Blayney's Dissert. on the seventy weeks. p. 37.

firm

*firm decision**. Hence the import of the clause will be, that the city should be rebuilt, continually increasing until at length the work should be completed: and that this work of rebuilding it should be carried on with the most firm decision on the part of the superintendants, in spite of all the opposition which they might encounter in the progress of it either from within or from without.

7. I translate בצוק העתים *in the short space of the times*. This is the literal version, which, with Mr. Wintle, I prefer to the metaphorical version *in troublous times* adopted in our English translation. The times, it is true, were sufficiently troublous, and many impediments were thrown in the way of the business even to the end of the administration of Nehemiah: but I doubt whether this be the precise meaning intended to be conveyed by the expression. Since *the sixty nine weeks*, which bring us unto Messiah the prince, are divided into *seven weeks* and *sixty two weeks*, we may naturally

* "In one of the manuscripts collated at Paris the latter of "these words is read with the preposition ב before it, ובחרוץ, "which strengthens the supposition of its being a gerund: "and, though I do not find that any of the collations exhibit "רחוב with the like prefix, yet the reading of this word by the "LXX with the preposition εἰς before it affords some reason to "presume that it might have been so read in some of the more "ancient copies." Dr. Blayney's Dissert. p. 37.

conclude,

conclude, that they are so divided, not arbitrarily, but for some good reason. Now, if we translate the original expression *in troublous times*, we shall no where throughout the whole prophecy find any intimation, why *the seven weeks* are thus cut off from the beginning of *the sixty nine weeks:* but, if we render it *in the short space of the times*, we shall then learn, that this short space, namely *the seven weeks*, short when compared to *the sixty two weeks*, is the period during which Jerusalem should be rebuilt. Accordingly, the passage is translated in the Vulgate *in angustia temporum;* by A. Purver, *in the shortest of the times;* and in the Encyclopedie, *dans le peu de tems**.

8. In the 26th verse I consider the verb יִכָּרֵת as the future of *Kal*, not of *Niphal;* and thence think, with Dr. Blayney, that it ought to be rendered actively, though I do not assign precisely the same signification to it that he does. I understand it in a moral sense; and render it *he shall divorce*, or *he shall cut off by a bill of divorce.* Such is the import of its derivative כְּרִיתוּת; which is properly rendered by our translators *divorcement*, though its literal ideal meaning is *a cutting off:* hence, in Deut. xxiv. 1, 3, where it occurs, Aquila explains it by the word κοπης; and Symmachus, by διακοπης.

* See Mr. Wintle's Translation of Daniel in loc.

Mr.

Mr. Parkhurst asserts, that its radical verb כרת does not occur in this sense in the Bible: but very rightly observes, that "there is no reason to doubt "but it was used in the Hebrew of Ecclus. xxv. "26 or 36, *If she* (thy wife) *go not as thou wouldst* "*have her*, cut *her* off (Gr. απολιμε) *from thy* "*flesh**." I disagree with him in thinking that the verb כרת never occurs in the Bible in the sense of *divorcing*, for I believe such to be its import in the present passage. The use that I make of this translation will be seen hereafter. Many are very unwilling to give up the *passive* sense of the verb, and the translation of the subsequent clause ואין לו *but not for himself*, considering the whole as a remarkable attestation to the doctrine of the atonement made by the voluntary sacrifice of the Son of God. Happily, the truth of this all-important doctrine does not rest upon a passage, the context of which, as it appears to me, forbids it to be so translated. *The sixty nine weeks* bring us *unto the Messiah:* yet, if יכרת be considered as the future of *Niphal* and be passively rendered, the Messiah is also to be *cut off* after these very *sixty nine weeks*. *Unto the Messiah* however, as I have already argued, must mean *unto his coming* either natural or

* Heb. Lex. Vox כרת. Thus Buxtorf, "כריתות *Repudium*, "quasi conjugii scissio vel rescissio."

official:

official: it cannot, without a most unnatural perversion of the phrase denote *unto his death*. And *after sixty nine weeks* must mean *immediately after* or *at the close of sixty nine weeks:* for, if *after* is to be taken in a large sense, this notation of time is altogether indefinite and therefore evidently useless; because, if Messiah be not cut off *precisely* at the end of *the sixty nine weeks*, but at the end of *sixty nine weeks* and some *additional* portion of time (no matter whether it be longer or shorter), it is not easy to discover the utility of specifying the exact term of *sixty nine weeks*, when the prophet might have expressed himself with perfect accuracy by saying *sixty nine weeks and one year, two years, half a week*, or *whatever might be the additional portion of time*. Since then *the coming of the Messiah* is fixed to the end of *the sixty nine weeks, his death* cannot *likewise* be at the end of them: for that would make *his coming* synchronize with *his death*, and thus allow no time for the discharge of his prophetic office. To this may be added, that it can be positively shewn, as it will hereafter be shewn *, that his death takes place at the end of *the seventy weeks:* hence it plainly cannot *also* take place at the end of *the sixty nine weeks;* which we

* Chap. vi. § I. 1. (1.) (2.) (3.) 2. This point has already been briefly touched upon in Chap. iii. § I. 3.

must

must conclude (unless we make the word *after* perfectly nugatory and indefinite), if we translate the passage *after the weeks seven and the weeks sixty and two Messiah shall be cut off but not for himself.* In fact, the most strenuous advocates for the unnatural supposition, that *unto the Messiah* means *unto the death of the Messiah,* even after they have adopted the expedient of computing by lunar years of 360 days each, are still unable to make the crucifixion fall out, where according to *their* scheme it ought to fall out, at the close of *the sixty nine weeks:* for Bp. Lloyd, Mr. Marshall, and Mr. Butt, are all obliged to acknowledge, that it happens, not at the end of *the sixty nine weeks,* but nearly a year *after* their expiration. But, if it be thus evident, that the death of the Messiah does not take place at the close of *the sixty nine weeks;* and, if it be acknowledged, that the word *after* cannot, without running into a most unwarrantable licence of interpretation, be understood in what Dr. Prideaux calls *a large sense,* but what in reality is just the sense which it may be convenient for an expositor to assign to it: then it will follow, that to render יִכָּרֵת passively, and to understand it to relate to *the cutting off of the Messiah by a violent death,* must necessarily be erroneous. If then it cannot be rendered passively as the future of *Niphal,* it must be rendered actively as the future of *Kal.* It must therefore relate to

something that the Messiah *does*, not to what he *suffers*: a conclusion indeed, which inevitably must be drawn from the circumstance of the thing expressed by יכרת synchronizing with the *coming* of the Messiah, and preceding his *death* at the end of *the seventy weeks*.

9. The word ישחית has usually been understood in the *physical* sense of *destroying*; and, whatever nominative case may be ascribed to it, has been translated *shall destroy*, and has been supposed to relate to the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans under Titus. I rather incline to interpret it in a *moral* sense, and to consider it as assigning *the reason why* Messiah should cut off from himself by divorce his mystic wife the Levitical church. This verb, both in *Pihel* and *Hiphil*, signifies not only transitively *to corrupt*, but likewise intransitively *to be corrupt* or *to act corruptly*. Thus, in *Pihel*, we have שחת עמך *thy people hath acted corruptly**: and thus, in *Hiphil*, the conjugation here used by Daniel, we have העם משחיתים *the people were acting corruptly* †. Hence, in a similar manner, I translate the future *Hiphil* ישחית *shall act corruptly* or *shall corrupt themselves*.

10. In our common English version, the first clause at the beginning of the 26th verse is arranged

* Exod. xxxii. 7. † 2 Chron. xxvii. 2.

and

and translated *Messiah shall be cut off, but not for himself;* and the second clause, *and the people of the prince that shall come shall destroy the city and the sanctuary.* According to my arrangement and translation, the first clause is *Messiah shall cut off by a bill of divorce, so that they shall be no more his, both the city and the sanctuary;* and the second clause, *the people of the prince that shall come shall act corruptly.* In this arrangement of the two clauses, though not in the translation of them, I have followed Dr. Blayney: and, for the propriety of it, in addition to the reasons already assigned, the word וקצו *and the end thereof,* in the following or third clause of the verse, affords a fresh argument. For, if the other arrangement be adopted, it is not easy to assign the antecedent, to which the pronoun *thereof* has reference. *The Messiah* it could not be: for how could his *end be with a flood?* Nor could it be *the city and sanctuary:* for then the pronoun should have been in the plural, instead of the singular, number. Nor could it be *the city* singly, as including *the sanctuary:* because העיר *the city* is feminine, but the pronoun is masculine. Nor lastly could it be *the people*, if by *people* were meant *the Roman army;* nor yet their *Commander:* because neither did *he*, nor his *army*, come to an *end by a flood;* but, on the contrary, succeeded in utterly destroying Jerusalem. But,

if by the *people of the prince that should come* be intended *the Jewish nation,* which it plainly must be according to the present arrangement, but which it no less plainly cannot be according to the other arrangement; then both the grammar is duly preserved, and the import of the prophetic imagery remains unviolated. For we obtain a regular antecedent for *thereof,* namely *the Jewish nation:* and *the end* of that nation was *by a flood;* which, as it is well known, signifies in the prophetic language *a hostile invasion;* that, like a mighty inundation, sweeps away all before it, and spreads havock and desolation over a whole country *.

* For this argument I am indebted to Dr. Blayney. He himself indeed understands קץ to mean *the cutting off* or *the excision* of the Jewish nation, not *the end* or *termination* of it. But I doubt whether the word will bear such a translation. *The end* is called קץ, because it *cuts off* a term of existence from the preceding period; not because the nation, to which the substantive is applied, is *cut off* by hostile excision. Had the Jewish nation *quietly* and *without bloodshed* merged into the Roman empire, its *end* would just have completely arrived, and that *end* might just as properly have been expressed by the word קץ, as it is at present. The *violence* of its downfall is described, not by קץ which simply denotes its *termination*, but by שטף *the deluge* or *hostile invasion* that effected it. Indeed he himself immediately after translates the very same word, when connected with *war*, by *the end;* as thus, *unto the end of a war.*

11. The

11. The feminine *Niphal* participle נחרצת in the last clause of the 26th verse is by our translators not ill rendered *determined:* but they improperly construct it with the plural substantive *desolations*, instead of the feminine singular substantive *war*. It is a participle of the same verb חרץ, that occurs towards the latter end of the 25th verse. The meaning of this verb I there considered to be *to decide* or *to determine:* and in the same sense I think it ought here also to be understood. The most obvious and natural construction of the present passage is to suppose, that the feminine participle נחרצת agrees with the feminine substantive מלחמה, which it immediately succeeds. These two words therefore constructed together will signify *a war firmly decided upon*, or *a war inevitably predetermined.*

12. In the 27th verse I have followed Dr. Blayney and Mr. Wintle in translating כנף *the border*, as being that version of the word which seems the most easy and the least constrained. Nor in reality does it at all clash with Christ's quotation of the phrase *the abomination of desolation*, which in the Hebrew immediately follows כנף. "Our Sa-
"viour's words," says Dr. Blayney, "are thus re-
"ported by St. Matthew; *When ye therefore shall*
"*see the abomination of desolation, spoken of by*
"*Daniel the prophet, stand in the holy place,*

"

" εν τοπῳ ἁγιῳ*: and by St. Mark somewhat differ-
" ently; *But, when ye shall see the abomination of*
" *desolation, spoken of by Daniel the prophet, stand-*
" *ing where it ought not,* ὁπου ου δει †. But by St.
" Luke they are evidently paraphrased; *And, when*
" *ye shall see Jerusalem compassed with armies,*
" ὁταν δε ιδητε κυκλουμενην ὑπο στρατοπεδων την Ιερου-
" σαλημ ‡. From which difference it is evident,
" first of all, that the evangelists did not think it
" necessary to adhere to the precise words used by
" our Lord, provided they kept up to the sense of
" them; and secondly, that by *the abomination of*
" *desolation standing in the holy place,* or *where it*
" *ought not,* the same is meant as by *Jerusalem*
" *compassed with armies;* the armies of the Roman
" empire, which were an abomination to the Jews
" on account of their standards to which a religious
" worship was paid §, at the same time that they
" were used as the immediate instrument of their
" desolation. Let us now consider the Hebrew
" text. Some persons seem to be much elated
" (perhaps more so than there is occasion for) on
" account of a discovery lately made in the colla-
" tion of a Hebrew manuscript in the royal library
" at Paris, which is said to contain a reading more

* Ch. xxiv. 15. † Ch. xiii. 14. ‡ Ch. xxi. 20.
§ Joseph. de bell. Jud. l. vi. c. 6. § 1.

" conformable

" conformable to the words cited by our Savi-
" our, than that which is found in the printed
" copies. The difference is, that, instead of
" ועל כנף שקוצים משמם, the manuscript reads
" ובהיכל יהיה שיקוץ משומם; which literally
" translated is, *and in the temple shall be the abo-*
" *mination of desolation*, or *of the desolator*, and is
" the same with what is to be met with in the Latin
" Vulgate, *et erit in templo abominatio desolationis.*
" But I am afraid there is a much greater reforma-
" tion of the text made here, than can reasonably
" be expected, or indeed be approved of. Thus
" much perhaps we may be induced to give the
" manuscript credit for, that it has given the true
" reading of שיקוץ *abomination* in the singular num-
" ber, instead of שקוצים in the plural: which latter
" is disclaimed by most of the ancient versions, as
" well as by the Gospel citations; and besides will
" scarcely afford a tolerable sense consistent with
" grammar *. It is also easy to conceive how a
" transcriber might be led to add the *Mem* to the
" end of שיקוץ from the next word beginning with

* " If we read שקוצים, it cannot be construed *in regimine*
" with the following noun, as it should then be read שקוצי.
" Of this our translators seem to have been well aware, who,
" as well as the *Syriac*, have referred it back to the noun pre-
" ceding כנף; but, with what propriety as to the sense, is mat-
" ter of question."

" the

" the same letter, after which the transposition of
" the *Jod* would be deemed a natural correction.
" But the difference is so very great between
" ועל כנף and ובהיכל יהיה, that the one could not
" possibly be substituted for the other by accident;
" and, supposing there was a design to change
" ובהיכל יהיה, I think it would puzzle any man
" to guess why the words ועל כנף should be fixed
" on to be placed in their stead; whereas the rea-
" son is sufficiently obvious for making the change
" in the contrary direction. But after all, is it true
" that the new found reading is more conformable
" in this particular to our Lord's quotation than the
" old established one? To me, I must confess,
" it appears otherwise. Indeed it is far from be-
" ing clear, that our Saviour cited from the pro-
" phet Daniel any more than the two words which
" signify *the abomination of desolation;* for his
" words are, *When ye shall see the abomination of*
" *desolation spoken of by Daniel the prophet:*
" whereas, if the rest had been a part of the cita-
" tion, it ought rather to have been expressed thus,
" *When ye shall see the abomination of desolation*
" *standing in the holy place,* or *where it ought not,*
" *as spoken of,* or *foretold, by the prophet Daniel.*
" But neither do the terms *holy city,* or *where it*
" *ought not,* necessarily imply *the structure* or *edi-*
" *fice of the temple;* but take in *the environs of it*
" also,

" also, *the mountain on which it was built:* and
" even *the whole city with its suburbs*, on account
" of its relation to God, was accounted *holy* too,
" and therefore unfit to be profaned by the ap-
" proach of any thing so abominable, as were the
" idols of heathen worship. Nor is it true, that
" the Roman legions ever did set up their stand-
" ards in the temple, בהיכל, that is, within or
" upon the house or building, till such time as the
" city was finally taken: whereas the fact alluded
" to by Christ was manifestly something *prior* to
" that event, as a *prognostic* of it*; and doubtless
" was meant of that near approach which Cestius
" made, when he had taken the lower town, and
" came near enough to attempt setting fire to the
" outer gate of the temple †. Then I think it
" might properly be said, that *the abomination of*
" *desolation* was על כנף, upon *the border* or *out-*
" *skirt* of both the city and temple; for כנף,
" which primarily signifies *wing*, is used metapho-

* This is plain, both from the circumstance of our Lord's directing his disciples not to think flight necessary until they should see *the abomination of desolation standing in the holy place;* and from St. Luke's explaining this language to mean, not *the final destruction of Jerusalem when the standards were worshipped in the temple*, but *the previous compassing of the city with armies.*

† Joseph. de bell. Jud. lib. ii. cap. 19. § 5.

" rically

" rically to denote the *border* or *extremity* of any " thing, as of a garment, and also of a place or " territority. So that *the abomination of desolation* " *being on the border* answers well to *Jerusalem* " *being compassed with armies, standing in the holy* " *place*, and *where*, in the estimation of a Jew " at least, *they* certainly *ought not*. This there- " fore I conceive to be the genuine reading, " ועל כנף שיקוץ משמם, and that it ought to be " rendered thus; *And on the border* (encompassing " and pressing close upon the besieged) shall be " *the abomination of desolation* *."

Yet, though I believe that the passage ought thus to be translated and understood, I think it right to observe, that על כנף might also be rendered *upon the wing*, that is to say, *upon the wing of a building*. According to this version, *the wing* might be understood of *the tower Antonia*, which formed a kind of wing to the temple, being joined to it by porticos: and *the placing the abomination of desolation upon that wing* might relate to the lodgment made by the Romans with their military idols the standards † upon the tower Antonia, at the very time when Titus is said to have had the first intelligence that the daily sacrifices of the temple had ceased a little

* Dr. Blayney's Dissertation on the seventy weeks, p. 50, 51, 52.

† Tacitus calls them *propria legionum numina*.

before

before *—But to this translation the objection will manifestly recur, that it does not accord with the sense which our Lord gives to the expression. He exhorts his disciples to *flee into the mountains* from the devoted city, *when they should see the abomination of desolation standing in the holy place;* or, as St. Luke paraphrases his words, *to flee into the mountains, when they should see Jerusalem compassed with armies.* It is plain therefore, that Christ considered the abomination of desolation as standing in the holy place *before* the Roman standards were set up and worshipped in the precincts of the temple, even from the very time when Jerusalem was compassed with armies; and thence exhorted his disciples to avail themselves of the opportunity that should be afforded them of seeking their safety in flight, which they could not have done had they waited until the standards were set up either in the tower Antonia or in the temple. Now with this view of the prophecy, if we translate על כנף *upon the border*, that is, *upon the extreme circumference of the city*, the passage will exactly agree. And, in further confirmation of the propriety of the version, it may be observed, that our Lord does not charge the disciples to wait until they saw the daily sacrifice taken away, and *then* to flee

* See Dr. Blayney's Dissert. p. 53, 54.

into

into the mountains; because, had they waited *thus* long, their flight would have been impracticable: but only until they saw the abomination of desolation standing in the holy place, or where it ought not; in other words, until they saw Jerusalem compassed by the Roman armies. Accordingly, they waited *exactly* so long. Cestius invested Jerusalem; and the Christians acknowledged the sign predicted by their divine master in his explanation of this part of Daniel's prophecy. But how could they escape, as they had been warned to do, when the city was compassed by hostile assailants? Their Lord was not unmindful of them; nor was it possible, that one jot or one tittle of his words should fail. Cestius, unaccountably upon military principles, drew off his army for a short season; and the Christians escaped *.

13. The

* Mr. Butt gives a different turn to the translation *upon the wing*, supposing it to import, that *the abomination of desolation or the Roman eagles should take wing towards Jerusalem.* This exposition is certainly not liable to the same objection as that which refers *the wing* to *the tower Antonia* considered as a wing of the temple: but it may be a question, how far the Hebrew idiom will accord with the English. *We* indeed speak of *a bird being upon the wing*, meaning that the bird is in the act of flying; but it does not therefore follow, that על כנף would convey any such idea to the mind of a Jew. The expression in Psalm xviii. 10, *upon the wings of the wind*, which Mr. Butt cites in support of his gloss, has no analogy to our *English* idiom,

13. The translation of the last clause of the prediction is now the only matter which remains to be accounted for: and here the chief difficulty will be removed, if we can ascertain the proper nominative case to the verb תחך *shall be poured.* This, I am persuaded, is the feminine substantive כלה *an utter consumption* or *full end.* The compounded word ועד I take conjunctively for *even until,* and consider it as limiting the time during which the sacrifice and meat-offering should be abolished and the land of Judèa should lie desolate. The time, thus specified for the continuance of their abolition, is the period which elapses from their being caused to cease in *the half week* to the pouring of utter destruction upon the desolator: "in half a week he shall cause "the sacrifice and meat-offering to cease (for upon "the border shall be the abomination that maketh "desolate), EVEN UNTIL an utter end, and that "firmly decided upon, shall be poured upon the "desolator*."

14. In

idiom. It is not said, that *Jehovah was upon the wing,* but that *he flew upon the wings of the wind.* Comment. on the proph. of the lxx weeks. p. 6.

* "See עד used in this manner with a future verb, Gen. "xxxviii. 11. Prov. vii. 23. Hos. x. 12. It is not clear, "whether our last English translators of the Bible did not "understand ועד in this sense, as may be seen from pointing "their version in the following manner: *and for the over-*

"*spreading*

14. In this passage, the verb חרץ again occurs for the third time in the course of the present prophecy, and in the same form of its feminine *Niphal* participle נחרצה that it had already once before occurred in. I still translate it in the same sense of *firmly deciding*, and suppose it here to agree with the feminine substantive כלה the nominative case to the verb תחך; *an utter end, and that firmly decided upon:* that is to say, though vengeance may seem to linger, yet is it firmly determined, it shall surely be poured out at the last upon the head of the now triumphant desolator.

15. The last word in the prophecy שומם I render actively *the desolator*, instead of passively *the desolated.* The participle itself is doubtless capable of being rendered in either sense, being from its formation ambiguous: but, since Daniel twice elsewhere* uses it actively, and since (as will hereafter appear†) there are abundant rea-

" *spreading of abominations he shall make it desolate, even until* " *the consummation, and that determined, shall be poured upon* " *the desolate.* But it is certainly so taken in the old English " version of Queen Elisabeth's time, which reads, *even until* " *the consummation determined shall be poured upon the desolate.*" Blayney's Dissert. p. 54.

* Dan. viii. 13—xii. 11.

† Chap. vi. § VI. 3.

sons for concluding that it ought so likewise to be understood here, I have translated it accordingly *.

* It is translated in the same manner by Bp. Lloyd.

CHAPTER V.

Concerning the mutual relation of the different clauses of the prophecy considered in the abstract.

IT is highly useful and important to obtain a clear view *in the abstract* of the mutual relation of the different clauses of a prophecy, before we attempt to interpret that prophecy by applying it to facts. Such was the plan, on which Mr. Mede drew up his *Clavis Apocalyptica;* wherein the synchronisms of the different parallel parts of the Revelation are merely arranged and established, without even an attempt to explain the meaning of the predictions themselves. These being duly arranged, he was then prepared to enter upon the work of regular exposition by comparing the prophecies with their supposed historical accomplishment. The plan is so judicious, that I purpose to adopt it in the following investigation.

Dan. IX.

24. Weeks seventy *are* the precise period upon thy people and upon thy holy city, to complete the apostasy, and to perfect the sin-offerings, and to make atonement for iniquity, and to cause *him who is* the righteousness of the eternal ages to come, and to seal the vision and the prophet, and to anoint the Most Holy One.

25. But know and understand, from the going forth of an edict to rebuild Jerusalem unto the Anointed One the Prince *shall be* weeks seven and weeks sixty and two: it shall be rebuilt, with perpetual increase and firm decision, even in the short space of the times.

26. And, after the weeks seven and the weeks sixty and two, the Anointed One shall cut off by divorce, so that *they shall be* no more his, both the city and the sanctuary.

For the people of the prince that shall come shall act corruptly: but the end thereof *shall be* with a flood; and unto the end of a war firmly decided upon *shall be* desolations.

27. Yet he shall make firm a covenant with many for one week.

And in half a week he shall cause the sacrifice and meat-offering to cease (for upon the border

shall be the abomination that maketh desolate), even until an utter end, and that firmly decided upon, shall be poured upon the desolator.

From an attentive view of this prophecy we may, I think, establish the following positions, which will be useful in binding down the interpretation of it within certain fixed limits and in checking any unwarrantable flights of imagination.

1. *The seventy weeks, mentioned in the 24th verse, must be understood as looking prospectively.*

This point I argue in the following manner. The expression שבעים שבעים is rendered *seventy weeks* by all the old versions *: it is so understood by all the ancient commentators in their several expositions of the prophecy: it is likewise so understood by the Jewish writers, notwithstanding the formidable argument which it holds forth in favour of Christianity: and the general context of the whole prediction imperiously requires, that it *should* be so understood. The version of it proposed by Dr. Blayney, namely *weeks sufficient*, possesses none of these recommendations. It contradicts the translation, which has generally been

* I have already observed, that the oriental versions may however, like the Hebrew, be ambiguous.

received

received both by ancients and moderns, both by Jews and Christians: it does not quadrate with the context of the prophecy: it exhibits Daniel as affecting unnecessary obscurity: it produces a phraseology unparalleled in Scripture: it is palpably contrived to serve a turn. If then the expression must necessarily be rendered *seventy weeks*, those *seventy weeks* must necessarily look *prospectively;* because the particulars to be accomplished within them cannot be shewn to have been accomplished within the precise number of *seventy weeks* or 490 years *previous* to Daniel's vision.

2. *Since the seventy weeks are the appointed period to effect six different particulars specified by Daniel, their termination must be marked by the effecting of some one or more of these particulars.*

This is manifest from the circumstance of *the seventy weeks* being a precise limited time. If they do not expire with some one of the specified particulars, but extend *beyond* the last of them, then they cannot with propriety be simply said to have been appointed for the *effecting* of them: because, if they extend beyond the last to no remarkable era, then a smaller portion of time, precisely reaching to the last, ought to have been marked out; and, if they extend beyond the last to an era noted for some remarkable event, then that event ought to have been specified in the list of particulars, other-

wise the list is defective, and they are in reality the appointed period to effect something *more* than the prophet teaches us they should effect. On the other hand, if they do not expire with some one of the specified particulars, but terminate *before* all those particulars are accomplished, then a larger portion of time ought to have been marked out: because it is manifest, that *seventy weeks* cannot be said to have been appointed to effect all the particulars in question, if some of the particulars in question be not effected until long after the expiration of *the seventy weeks*. But, if *the seventy weeks* can neither extend *beyond* the last particular, nor fall *short* of it; then they must terminate *exactly with* its accomplishment.

3. *Though the seventy weeks must terminate with some one or more of the particulars specified, we are not bound to suppose that all the particulars are precisely synchronical.*

This point seems to require no proof: for, since it is only said that *the seventy weeks* are the precise period within which all the particulars should be effected, it is plain, that, though they must *expire* with some one or more of the particulars, the others may be effected either *earlier* or *later* in the course of *the seventy weeks*.

4. *Since the seventy weeks are the appointed period upon the holy city, and since they commence with*

with the edict for the rebuilding of it, they must be the times of the holy city, and must therefore synchronize with its duration.

This position is Mr. Mede's*; and he adduces it for the purpose of confuting those, who with Funccius compute *the seventy weeks* from the seventh year of Artaxerxes and make them expire with the passion of Christ†. But it equally confutes his own hypothesis, even if we allow his chronological arrangement to be better established than it is. For, if *the seventy weeks* be the times of the holy city, and if by *the holy city* the *literal holy city* be understood, then its times amount not merely to 490 years as Mr. Mede endeavours to shew, but to 605 years: because Jerusalem began to be rebuilt in pursuance of the edict of Cyrus in the year A. C. 536, and was destroyed by the Romans in the year 70 of the Christian era ‡.

* "These *seventy weeks* are the times allotted for the continuance of the Holy city, and therefore must they last as long "as it lasted, and end with the end thereof." Works. B. iii. p. 697.

† "Funccius his computation of *the seventy weeks* from the "seventh year of Artaxerxes Longimanus (whence to Christ's "passion he finds just 490 years)" is untenable, "because it "ends *the seventy weeks* (which by the text were allotted for "the Holy city) long before the times of the Holy city were "fulfilled." Works. B. iii. p. 710.

‡ I have already shewn, that the literal Jerusalem did most undoubtedly *begin* to be rebuilt from the first year of Cyrus.

5. *The*

5. The seven weeks, the sixty and two weeks, and the one week, must be estimated as component parts of the seventy weeks.

This appears from the general context of the prophecy: since *the seventy weeks* look prospectively and are evidently mentioned as the leading number in the introduction to the prophecy, and since the smaller periods of weeks also look prospectively and are no less evidently mentioned as subordinate numbers in the prophecy itself, the natural presumption is, that the smaller prospective numbers are included in the larger prospective number. It further appears from the circumstance of there being no date assigned to the commencement of *the seventy weeks*, except that which is assigned to the commencement of *the seven weeks* that precede *the sixty and two weeks:* whence we must conclude, that *the seventy weeks* and *the seven weeks* begin synchronically. It lastly appears from the exact accordance of the smaller numbers with the larger number; *seven weeks, sixty two weeks,* and *one week,* making up the precise sum of *seventy weeks.*

6. The seventy weeks must be continuous; that is to say, the seven weeks, the sixty two weeks, and the one week, into which the seventy weeks are subdivided, must succeed each other in regular chronological order, the two latter of these smaller periods commencing

commencing exactly where their respective predecessors terminated.

This position is one that must naturally and obviously occur to any person, whose judgment is not warped by a predilection for some favourite system which requires a different arrangement. If we concede the liberty of chronologically separating the smaller periods from each other, we must at once give up every systematic interpretation of the prophecy; and, instead of feeling ourselves to tread upon sure ground, we must resign ourselves to the arbitrary humour of the commentator. One person may wish to separate *the seven weeks* from *the sixty two weeks;* another, to separate *the sixty two weeks* from *the one week;* and a third, to separate them all three from each other, and to consider them as wholly distinct and unconnected periods. Every one of these various opinions has had its advocates: but who has a right to command assent to his own particular mode of separation in preference to any other? If the three small periods be not continuously successive, it appears to me, that by the aid of a tolerable share of ingenuity we may make pretty much what we please of the prophecy. We may, with Sir Isaac Newton, calculate *the seven weeks* from the yet *future* rebuilding of Jerusalem to the second advent of the Messiah; and, separating both this period and that of *the sixty two*

weeks

weeks from *the one week*, make *the one week* immediately succeed the crucifixion. We may, with Hippolytus and Apollinarius *, fix *the one week* to the age of the supposed personal Elias and Antichrist, place it at the end of the world, and make *the half week* the same as *the three times and a half* or *the* 1260 *days*. We may, with Bp. Lloyd, Mr. Marshall, and Mr. Butt, suppose *the seven weeks* and *the sixty two weeks* to be continuous, but deny the continuity of *the sixty two weeks* and *the one week*. We may, in short, ring as many changes upon the three numbers as we think proper; but what solid conviction shall we be able to work in the mind of any unprejudiced person? Nor is this the whole that may be said: the analogy both of the present prophecy and of other numerical prophecies requires that they should be estimated as continuous. Few doubt the continuity of *the seven weeks* and *the sixty two weeks:* indeed the complete reading in the 26th verse as preserved by Aquila and the Arabic, respecting the integrity of which I have no doubt, compels us to acknowledge their continuity. If then *two* of the periods be continuous, by what authority shall we pronounce, in defiance of analogy, that *the third* is not continuous? So again: in all the prophecies relative to *the three*

* Hieron. Comment. in Dan. in loc.

times

times and a half the period spoken of is never so expressed, but uniformly *a time, times* (or, if the word be supposed to be in the dual number, *two times*), *and the dividing of a time;* yet no person ever doubted the continuity of *the one time, the two times*, and *the half time*, or ever thought of separating them from each other. Surely then analogy requires us to allow the continuity of *the seven weeks, the sixty two weeks*, and *the one week*, which jointly make up the complete period of *the seventy weeks.*

7. *The holy city at the beginning of the prophecy must be the same as the city destined to be rebuilt; and the city destined to be rebuilt must be the same as the city which Messiah cuts off from being his by divorce.*

This position requires no other proof than an attentive consideration of the context.

8. *The prince that should come* (in the 26th verse) *must be the same person as the prince the Anointed One* (in the 25th verse); *that is to say, they must alike be the Messiah.*

That *the prince* in each verse should mean the same person, is required by the context: otherwise the prophecy is chargeable with the obscurity of introducing another person under the very same title as the Messiah, without any regular specification that another person is intended. *The prince* in the

25th

25th verse must be the Messiah, because he is so styled: *the prince* in the 26th verse must also be the Messiah, both because the most obvious construction of the context requires it, and because the word is joined with an epithet which plainly shews that the Messiah alone can be intended. *He that should come** is a well known descriptive appellation of the long expected Saviour. It was thus that his advent was foretold by Jacob: "the sceptre "shall not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver from "between his feet, until Shiloh *shall come* †." It was thus that he was announced by Balaam: "there "*shall come* a star out of Jacob, and a sceptre shall "rise out of Israel;—out of Jacob *shall come* he "that shall have dominion ‡." It was thus also that he was predicted by Isaiah, and Malachi, and Micah: "the Redeemer *shall come* to Zion, and "unto them that turn from transgression in Ja-"cob §:—behold I will send my messenger, and "he shall prepare the way before me; and the "Lord whom ye seek *shall suddenly come* to his "temple, even the messenger of the covenant whom "ye delight in; behold, *he shall come*, saith the "Lord of hosts: but who may abide *the day of* "*his coming*, and who shall stand *when he appear-*

* Ὁ ἐρχομενος, as the appellation is expressed in the Gospel.

† Gen. xlix. 10. ‡ Numb. xxiv. 17, 19.

§ Isaiah lix. 20.

"*eth*

" *eth**?—but thou, Bethlehem Ephratah, though " thou be little among the thousands of Judah, yet " out of thee *shall he come forth* unto me that is " to be ruler in Israel †." As he was announced by this style in the Old Testament, so is he acknowledged by the same style in the New. Thus we find that the chief priests, whose lips in this instance at least preserved knowledge, owned that Micah foretold the Messiah under the appellation of *he that should come* ‡. Thus, when John the Baptist sent his disciples to inquire whether Jesus were indeed the Messiah, the question which they ask is, " Art thou *he that should come*, or do we " look for another §?" Thus the Samaritan woman professes her faith in the expected advent of the Saviour: " I know that Messias *cometh* which " is called Christ; when he *is come*, he will tell us " all things ‖." And thus does our Lord himself speak of his ministry and coming: " behold, these " three years *I come* seeking fruit on this fig-tree, " and find none ¶." Exactly the same language is held respecting the second advent: " for yet a little " while, and *he that shall come* will come, and will " not tarry **." But it is needless to multiply

* Malach. iii. 1, 2. † Micah v. 2. ‡ Matt. ii. 6.
§ Matt. xi. 4—Luke vii. 19, 20. ‖ John iv. 25.
¶ Luke xiii. 7. ** Heb. x. 37.

citations

citations to prove so clear a matter. Not only the particular context of the present prophecy, but the general context of the whole Bible, requires us to understand *the Messiah* by Daniel's *Prince that should come* *.

9. *The person, who confirms the covenant with many and who causes the sacrifice and meat-offering to cease, must be the Messiah.*

This position necessarily follows from the preceding one: for there is no other nominative case to the succeeding verbs except *the Prince that shall come.*

10. *The righteousness of the everlasting ages, mentioned in the 24th verse, must be understood of a person; and that person must be the Messiah.*

It is said to be part of the office of the seventy weeks *to cause* this eternal righteousness *to come.* Now, since *the seventy weeks* look forward to *the atonement for iniquity,* made by the death of Christ; and since the 24th verse professes to be a detail of the grand particulars which they are to effect, *the coming of Christ* will be left wholly unnoticed unless it be specified by the phrase now under consideration. But, that it *is* specified by it, appears from the subsequent context. *The prince that*

* See Ep. Kidder's Demons. of the Messiah. part I. chap. v. p. 37.

should come is *the eternal righteousness that should be caused to come.* And *his coming* is declared to be at the end of *the seven weeks and the sixty two weeks:* for so long is to be the time *unto the Messiah*; which expression cannot mean *unto his death*, but must mean *unto his coming*. Such personifications, as that of *righteousness*, are not uncommon in Scripture. Thus Christ is styled by Jeremiah *our righteousness**: and thus he is said by St. Paul to be "made unto us *wisdom*, and *righteousness*, and "*sanctification*, and *redemption*†." Thus also, in the same vein of personification, Isaiah, speaking either of Abraham or Cyrus, asks, "Who raised up "*righteousness* from the east?" for such is the literal translation of the original, though the whole context shews that *a person* is intended‡: and thus the same prophet, foretelling the future glories of the house of Israel, declares, that in the last ages God will "make their officers *peace*, and their exactors "*righteousness*§." Similar phraseology was perfectly familiar to the Targumists, who were wont to style the expected Messiah *the Word of God, the Voice of God, the Name of God,* or *the Wisdom of God*‖. The first of these titles is claimed for our

* Jerem. xxiii. 6.
† 1 Cor. i. 30.
‡ Isaiah xli. 2, 3.
§ Isaiah lx. 17.
‖ See Jamieson's Vindication of the doctrine of Scripture, b. i. passim.

Lord

Lord by St. John; and the last, as we have just seen, by St. Paul, who likewise denominates him *the power of God**. All these appellations of the Messiah, which are plainly personifications, were so familiar to the Jews and their neighbours, that, when Simon Magus bewitched the Samaritans, giving out that he was some great one, they unanimously pronounced him to be *the great power of God*, which was only another mode of acknowledging him to be the Christ. Hence I think myself perfectly warranted in understanding *the righteousness of the eternal ages*, whose *coming* Daniel announces in the present prophecy, to be a personification of the Messiah. Nor am I singular in this interpretation. St. Jerome tells us, that the Hebrews of his time adopted it†: and they have been followed by more than one commentator in subsequent ages both Christian and Jewish‡. By thus expound-

* "Christ, the power of God, and the wisdom of God." 1 Cor. i. 24.

† "Hebræi quid de hoc loco sentiant brevi sermone per-
"stringam, fidem dictorum his a quibus dicta sunt derelin-
"quens—Nascitur Christus, id est justitia sempiterna." Hieron. Comment. in Dan. in loc.

‡ "Quid hæc *justitia*?—Est Christus, qui dicitur *Jehovah*
"*justitia nostra*—Justitia hæc dicitur *æterna*, quia persona
"quæ hanc justitiam merita est infinita est ac æterna" (Poli. Synop. in loc.). "*Justitia sempiterna*, Heb. *Justitia sæculo-*
"*rum*,

expounding *the eternal righteousness that should come* to denote *a person* and not *a thing*, we shall make the passage exactly accord with the language of the New Testament, in which the appellation of *the Just One* or *the Righteous One* is peculiarly appropriated to the Messiah*. And it may further be observed, that there is one place in which this *Just One* is spoken of in the very phraseology of Daniel, almost as if an interpretation of this part of the prophecy had been designed: "they have slain "them, which shewed before of *the coming of the* "*Just One*, of whom ye have been now the be- "trayers and murderers†."

11. *The anointing of the Most Holy, mentioned in the 24th verse, must relate to the anointing of a person; which person must be the Messiah.*

Dr. Blayney objects to this exposition of the clause, on the ground that "the words קדש קדשים "*holy of holies* are constantly applied in the "Old Testament, not to *persons*, but to *things;* to

"*rum*, id est Christus, qui, quasi sol, justitiæ suæ radios in "omnium sæculorum, tam ante quam post se, homines diffu- "dit, et Ecclesiam quasi regnum æternum justitiæ, id est justè "et piè viventium, instituit. Ita interpretes, quin et Talmu- "distæ ac Rabbini passim, per *justitiam hanc* intelligunt *Mes- "siam*. Vide eos apud Finum lib. 5. Flagelli cap. 5." Cornel. a Lapid. Comment. in Dan. in loc.

* See Acts iii. 14. xxii. 14. † Acts vii. 52.

"the

" the temple or sanctuary itself, the altar, vessels, " and utensils belonging to the temple, together " with the offerings and other appurtenances of the " temple worship: and it was by the ceremony of " anointing that these things were directed to be " cleansed and sanctified*, so as to be fitted to " appear in the presence of that pure and holy Be- " ing, to whom this worship was directed†." I cannot think this objection a very formidable one. So far as the mere words themselves are concerned, they are undoubtedly just as capable of being translated *the holy one of holy ones*, as *the holy thing of holy things*. How they are to be understood, whether of *a person* or of *a thing*, can only, I apprehend, be determined by the context. Now, in the present instance, the context imperiously requires us to understand *a person*. In the course of the prophecy, we twice read of *the Anointed One:* and this Anointed One is styled *the Prince*, and *the Prince that should come*. Hence it was argued, that *the eternal righteousness that should come* must be *the Prince that should come:* and it may now be similarly argued, that, according to the most natural view of the general context, *the Most Holy that was to be anointed* must be *the person who is called the Anointed One in consequence of this very anointing*.

* Exod. xxx. 25—29. † Dr. Blayney's Dissert. p. 22.

Besides,

Besides, if *the eternal righteousness* be a person, it will obviously follow, that *the Most Holy* is a person likewise. In this sense accordingly the clause has been understood by the Jews themselves, who perhaps in some respects may be esteemed more unexceptionable evidence than Christian commentators*. The title of *the Most Holy*, as applied to Christ, perfectly corresponds with the language used re-

* According to Jerome, the interpretation of the Hebrews was, "Ungetur sanctus sanctorum, de quo in psalterio legimus "*propterea unxit te Deus, Deus tuus, oleo lætitiæ præ consortibus* "*tuis.* Qui et in alio loco dicet, de se, *Sancti estote, quia et* "*ego sanctus sum*" (Hieron. Comment. in Dan. in loc.). Cornelius a Lapide speaks to the same purpose. "*Et ungatur* "*sanctus sanctorum.* Ut scilicet Spiritu Sancto consecretur "Christus in sanctissimum sacerdotem, regem, prophetam, "doctorem, legislatorem, et redemptorem orbis. Hebræi, ut "mox dicam, vertunt, *et ungatur sanctitas sanctitatum*, vel *sanc-* "*tum sanctorum*, vel *sanctuarium sanctuariorum*, qui *non est* "*alius quam ipse Messias sanctificatus de filiis David*, ait R. "Barnahaman apud Finum lib. v. Flagelli c. 5. Et R. Mo- "ses Gerundensis, *Messias*, ait, *vocatur sanctuarium sanctuario-* "*rum, quia futurum erat, ut in eo, secundum humanitatem, omnes* "*thesauri sapientiæ et scientiæ Dei requiescerent; eratque ipse su-* "*per omnem creaturam oleo gratiæ ac beneplaciti Dei ungendus.* "*Unde merito Hebræis dictus est* Messias, *Græcè* Christus, *Latinè* "Unctus. Ita ipse apud Galatin. lib. iv. cap. 18. Quocirca "Aquila vertit *ad ungendum sanctificatum sanctificatorum;* Sy- "rus, *Septuaginta hebdomedes requiescent super populum tuum,* "*et ad perficiendum visionem et prophetas, et ad Christum sanctum* "*sanctorum.*" Comment. in Dan. in loc.

 specting

specting him in the New Testament. He is called by the angel at the annunciation *that holy thing**: by St. Peter, *the Holy One*†: by the whole assembly of Christians, *the holy child of God*‡: by St. Paul, *holy and undefiled*§: and by St. John, *the Holy One*‖. Nay even the very devils were constrained to acknowledge him as *the Holy One of God* ¶.

12. *The causing of the sacrifice and meat-offering to cease must be considered as synchronizing with the appearance of the abomination of desolation; that is to say, so far synchronizing, that they are caused to cease in the course of the same war that Jerusalem is compassed by the Roman armies.*

My reasons for laying down the present position are these—1. The citation of our Lord fixes the appearance of *the abomination of desolation* to the age of the Jewish war. Now, though he seems to have quoted no more than the two words שיקוץ משמם *the abomination that maketh desolate*, yet those words do not stand in an *insulated* and *detached* form in the prophecy, but are *immediately connected* with the neighbouring context. The chronology therefore of the neighbouring context must,

* Το ἁγιον. Luke i. 35.
† Τον ἁγιον. Acts iii. 14.
‡ Acts iv. 30.
§ Heb. vii. 26.
‖ 1 John ii. 20. Apoc. iii. 7.
¶ Mark i. 24.

by

by every rule of composition, be determined by *their* chronology. Hence I believe Bp. Lloyd, Mr. Marshall, and Mr. Butt, to be right in also fixing *the abolition of the sacrifice and meat-offering* to the age of the Jewish war, and in explaining it to mean *the literal abolition of the Levitical sacrifices by the instrumentality of the Romans.* For, when we read, *In half a week he shall cause the sacrifice and meat-offering to cease, for upon the border shall be the abomination that maketh desolate;* we are forced almost irresistibly to conclude, by the obvious tenor of the passage, that these particulars ought to be referred to one and the same period; nor can that interpretation be thought natural, which entirely separates *the taking away of the sacrifice* from *the appearance of the abomination.*—2. This opinion will receive a vast accession of strength, if we find in the event, that the Levitical sacrifices *were* abolished synchronically with the appearance of *the desolating abomination* upon the border. But, that such *was* actually the case, is abundantly well known. *The desolating abomination* is pinned down by our Lord's citation to the age of the Jewish war: and, at the close of the siege of Jerusalem which took place *in* that war, the temple was destroyed, and the Levitical sacrifices were finally abolished. —3. If we are in doubt respecting the precise import of any passage, it is useful to compare it with

other parallel passages, should there be any such in existence. Now Daniel four times mentions *the desolating abomination*, or (as in one place he varies the expression) *the desolating revolt:* and, in every instance, it is uniformly connected with *the taking away of the sacrifice**. One of the places, in which he mentions it thus connected, is the present prophecy. Two out of the three remaining places are thought by many commentators to relate to the same event as *the desolating abomination* of the present prophecy most undoubtedly does, namely *the investing of Jerusalem by the Roman armies*†. At any rate, one of them *must* relate to the same event‡. If then *the taking away of the*

* "How long will be the term of the vision of the daily sacrifice and of the revolt that maketh desolate?—Yea, it (the he-goat's little horn) magnified itself even against the Prince of the host; and from him the daily sacrifice was taken away." Dan. viii. 13, 11.

"And in half a week he shall cause the sacrifice and meat-offering to cease, for upon the border shall be the abomination that maketh desolate." Dan. ix. 27.

"Arms shall stand up, and shall pollute the sanctuary of strength, and shall take away the daily sacrifice, and shall place the abomination that maketh desolate." Dan. xi. 31.

"From the time that the daily sacrifice shall be taken away by even setting up the abomination that maketh desolate, there shall be computed 1290 days." Dan. xii. 11.

† Dan. viii. 13. and Dan. xi. 31. ‡ Dan. xi. 31.

sacrifice

sacrifice in all these three places, one of them clearly of the same import as the place now under consideration, is so connected with *the appearance of the desolating abomination*, that they must be esteemed synchronical; *the taking away of the sacrifice* and *the appearance of the desolating abomination* in the prophecy of *the seventy weeks* must by analogy be esteemed synchronical likewise, because they are connected together precisely in the same manner. For, if *the taking away of the daily sacrifice* and *the placing of the abomination that maketh desolate* by the symbolical arm of the Roman empire, in the prophecy of *the things noted in the Scripture of truth* *, must relate to *the literal abolition of the Levitical sacrifices* and *the sacking of Jerusalem by the Romans under Titus:* we are surely required, by every rule of consistent interpretation, to admit, that *the causing of the sacrifice and meat-offering* to cease and *the appearance of the desolating abomination upon the border*, in the prophecy of *the seventy weeks*, must relate to the very same events; inasmuch as *the desolating abomination* is allowed in both instances to be that alluded to by our Lord. And, even if this were not the case, whatever might be the precise meaning of *the desolating abomination* in the three other passages, since it is plainly in

* Dan. xi. 31.

every

every one of them chronologically connected with *the abolition of the sacrifice*, analogy compels us to consider it also chronologically connected with *the abolition of the sacrifice* in the present passage. To myself, I must confess, the matter appears so plain, that I cannot refrain from wondering that so cool and so judicious a writer as Dr. Prideaux should ever have separated them from each other, and should ever have supposed that *the causing the sacrifice and the meat-offering to cease* could mean any thing else than *the abolition of the temple service by Titus*.

I shall conclude with exhibiting together, in one point of view, for the convenience of reference, the twelve abstract positions which I trust have been sufficiently established.

1. *The seventy weeks*, mentioned in the 24th verse, must be understood as looking *prospectively*.

2. Since *the seventy weeks* are the appointed period to effect six different particulars specified by Daniel, their termination must be marked by the effecting of some one or more of these particulars.

3. Though *the seventy weeks* must *terminate* with some one or more of the particulars specified, we are not bound to suppose that all the particulars are *precisely synchronical*.

4. Since *the seventy weeks* are the appointed period upon the holy city, and since they commence with

with the edict for the rebuilding of it, they must be the times of the holy city, and must therefore synchronize with its duration.

5. *The seven weeks, the sixty and two weeks,* and *the one week,* must be estimated as component parts of *the seventy weeks.*

6. *The seventy weeks* must be *continuous;* that is to say, *the seven weeks, the sixty-two weeks,* and *the one week,* into which *the seventy weeks* are subdivided, must succeed each other in regular chronological order, the two latter of these smaller periods commencing exactly where their respective predecessors terminated.

7. *The holy city* at the beginning of the prophecy must be the same as *the city destined to be rebuilt;* and *the city destined to be rebuilt* must be the same as *the city which Messiah cuts off from being his by divorce.*

8. *The Prince that should come* (in the 26th verse) must be the same person as *the Prince the Anointed One* (in the 25th verse); that is to say, they must alike be *the Messiah.*

9. *The person, who confirms the covenant with many and who causes the sacrifice and meat offering to cease,* must be the *Messiah.*

10. *The righteousness of the everlasting ages,* mentioned in the 24th verse, must be understood of *a person;* and that person must be *the Messiah.*

11. *The*

11. *The anointing of the Most Holy*, mentioned in the 24th verse, must relate to the anointing of *a person;* which person must be *the Messiah.*

12. *The causing of the sacrifice and meat-offering to cease* must be considered as synchronizing with *the appearance of the abomination of desolation;* that is to say, so far synchronizing, that they are caused to cease in the course of the same war that Jerusalem is compassed by the Roman armies.

Now, if I have at all succeeded in establishing these positions, no interpretation that contradicts any one of them can be deemed admissible. But it is obvious, that each interpretation, which has hitherto been considered, however unobjectionable it may be in some points, is irreconcileable with one or other of the preceding positions. Hence I think, that not one of them, as they stand at present, is perfectly tenable. We must inquire therefore, whether any exposition can be produced, which quadrates in all respects with such positions as may be established abstractedly.

CHAPTER

CHAPTER VI.

An inquiry into the proper interpretation of the prophecy.

HAVING now discussed the mode of computing *the seventy weeks*, the chronology of the different edicts from some one of which they must necessarily be computed, and the abstract mutual relation of the different clauses of the prophecy, we shall be prepared to investigate with greater advantage the proper interpretation of it.

I. WEEKS SEVENTY are THE PRECISE PERIOD UPON THY PEOPLE AND UPON THY HOLY CITY, TO COMPLETE THE APOSTASY, AND TO PERFECT THE SIN-OFFERINGS, AND TO MAKE ATONEMENT FOR INIQUITY, AND TO CAUSE him who is THE RIGHTEOUSNESS OF THE ETERNAL AGES TO COME, AND TO SEAL THE VISION AND THE PROPHET, AND TO ANOINT THE MOST HOLY ONE.

1. Since it is *a priori* uncertain from which of the edicts of the kings of Persia *the seventy weeks* are to be reckoned, since however they are to be reckoned

ed *prospectively**, since they must terminate with some one or more of the particulars here specified to be accomplished†, and since they must be esteemed an unbroken continuous period of time‡; it is manifest, that, if we can ascertain the particular with which they *terminate*, we shall thereby ascertain the proper date of their *commencement:* and, if that can be ascertained, we shall then tread upon sure ground, and shall have the key given us to interpret all the subordinate parts of the prophecy. Our first business therefore must be to inquire into the meaning of *the six particulars* here specified by Daniel, as destined to be accomplished in the course of *the seventy weeks*.

(1.) The first of them is, *the completion of the apostasy*.

The import of the word פֶּשַׁע has already been shewn to be *the revolt of a subject from the allegiance due to his lawful sovereign*. Hence, in a theological sense, particularly in the case of a theocracy such as the government of Israel was, it is equivalent to *apostasy* in a more or less intense degree. All the acts of idolatry, into which the Israelites were seduced, were so many acts of *rebellious apostasy* from their heavenly sovereign. Each of them

* According to the 1st abstract position.

† According to the 2d abstract position.

‡ According to the 6th abstract position.

was

was *a revolt*, in a far more special and definite manner than the idolatrous acts of the Gentiles; because God was *king* in Israel*, and therefore each act of idolatry was a denial of his supremacy, an act whereby his liege-men withdrew their allegiance and transferred it to another. Yet, bad as this senseless idolatry of the ancient Israelites may have been, their apostasy cannot be said to have been *completed* by any one particular act of it. Moreover *the seventy weeks* look *prospectively*; therefore their apostasy cannot have been completed *before* the time of Daniel. But we know, that after their restoration from Babylon, they never, at least nationally, relapsed into idolatry: yet, since *the seventy weeks* look *prospectively*, their apostasy must have been completed *subsequent* to that restoration. It must therefore be some withdrawing of their allegiance, palpable and atrocious no doubt to the very highest degree since it was to be an absolute *consummation* of all their former apostasies, yet of a different nature from any former act of rebellious idolatry, inasmuch as they were never after their restoration from Babylon nationally idolatrous. Now I know not any act perpetrated by the Jews subsequent to the time of Daniel, that can vindicate to

* 1 Sam. viii. 7. xii. 12. Isaiah xli. 21. xliii. 15. Jer. viii. 19.

itself

itself the tremendous preëminence of being *a consummation of apostasy*, except *ther formal rejection and judicial murder of their divine king when he dwelt among them veiling his majesty in a tabernacle of flesh.* " Rejoice greatly, O daughter of Zion," exclaims an inspired prophet, " shout, O daughter " of Jerusalem: behold, *thy king* cometh unto " thee; he is just, and having salvation; lowly, and " riding upon an ass *." Such was the title of the Messiah: a title, which he claimed as his due even in the very face of his enemies; a title, the claiming of which subjected him to the bitterest taunts †. But in what manner did the Jews receive their king? When Pilate scoffingly says to them, *Behold your king* ‡; their answer is, *Away with him, crucify him.* The governor inquires, *What shall I crucify your king?* the chief priests solemnly reply, as the representatives of their nation, *We have no king but Cesar* §. Is it possible to conceive a more palpable and deliberate withdrawing of allegiance from a sovereign, than this was? In their different acts of idolatry they seem for the most part, not so much to have altogether *rejected* their king,

* Zechar. ix. 9.

† See Matt. xxvii. 11, 29. Mark xv. 2, 9, 12, 18, 32. Luke xxiii. 2, 3, 37.

‡ John xix. 14. § John xix. 15.

as

as to have worshipped false gods *in conjunction* with him: but here we have the very *consummation* of apostasy, the very *completion* of revolt. Nor is their revolt confined to mere *words*, to bare *expressions* of defiance. To *strike* an earthly sovereign has ever been esteemed one of the greatest outrages against majesty; and the records of the whole world afford but very few instances of a king being *put to death*, with all the formality of legal mockery, by his rebellious subjects. But, in the case of the divine sovereign of Israel, *blows* were added to *insult*, and *murder* to *blows*. His claim of royalty exposed him to derision: he was crowned with thorns, and greeted with *Hail! king of the Jews*. His regal title was contemptuously nailed upon his cross: and, even while he was expiring in the midst of unutterable torments, the chief priests and scribes and elders, true to their purpose, insulted him to the last with express reference to this very title: "He saved "others; himself he cannot save: if he be *the king* "*of Israel*, let him now come down from the cross, "and we will believe him: he trusted in God, let him "deliver him now if he will have him; for he said, "I am the Son of God*." If the whole of this awful transaction be not *the completion of revolt*

* Matt. xxvii. 42, 43.

foretold

foretold by Daniel, it is difficult to conceive what else can have been intended by the Holy Spirit*.

(2.) The second particular is *the perfecting of the sin-offerings.*

All the offerings for sin under the Levitical dispensation were merely typical of the one great sin-offering of the Lamb of God. They were imperfect shadows of the true expiatory sacrifice, and possessed no inherent virtue or intrinsic merit. The only perfect and effectual sin-offering was the Messiah, who was appointed in the councils of God for this very purpose from the foundation of the world. When he came and devoted himself a willing victim to death, the shadowy sacrifices under the Law were perfected, and their intent was at once fully explained and accomplished. The author of the epistle to the Hebrews affords us the best commentary on this particular. "There is verily," says he, "a disannulling of the commandment going before "*for the weakness and unprofitableness thereof.* "For *the Law made nothing perfect, but the bring-* "*ing in of a better hope did;* by the which we draw "nigh unto God.—They truly were many priests, "because they were not suffered to continue by rea-

* The climax of the revolt, from its first breaking out to its completion, is accurately described by our Lord himself in the parable of *the householder and the vineyard.* See Matt. xxi. 33—45.

"son

" son of death: but this man, because he continueth
" ever, hath an unchangeable priesthood.—Who
" needeth not daily, as those high-priests, to offer
" up sacrifice, first for his own sins, and then for
" the people's; for this he did once, when he offer-
" ed up himself.—The priests went always into the
" first tabernacle, accomplishing the service of
" God: but into the second went the high-priest
" alone once every year, not without blood, which
" he offered for himself and for the errors of the
" people. The Holy Ghost this signifying, that the
" way into the holiest of all was not yet made mani-
" fest, while as the first tabernacle was yet
" standing: which was a figure for the time then
" present, in which were offered both gifts and sa-
" crifices, *that could not make him that did the ser-*
" *vice perfect as pertaining to the conscience;* which
" stood only in meats and drinks, and divers wash-
" ings, and carnal ordinances, imposed on them
" until the time of reformation. But Christ being
" come, an high-priest of good things to come, by
" a greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made
" with hands, that is to say, not of this building;
" neither by the blood of bulls and calves, but by
" his own blood, he entered in once into the holy
" place, having obtained eternal redemption for us.
" For, if the blood of bulls and of goats, and the
" ashes of an heifer sprinkling the unclean, sancti-

" fieth to the purifying of the flesh; how much
" more shall the blood of Christ, who through the
" eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God,
" purge your consciences from dead works to serve
" the living God?—Almost all things are by the
" Law purged with blood; and without shedding
" of blood there is no remission. It was therefore
" necessary, that the patterns of things in the hea-
" vens should be purified with these; but the hea-
" venly things themselves, with better sacrifices
" than these. For Christ is not entered into the
" holy places made with hands, which are the
" figures of the true; but into heaven itself, now to
" appear in the presence of God for us. Nor yet
" that he should offer himself often, as the high-
" priest entereth into the holy place every year with
" blood of others: for then must he often have suf-
" fered since the foundation of the world: but now
" once in the end of the world hath he appeared to
" put away sin by the sacrifice of himself. And, as
" it is appointed unto men once to die, but after this
" the judgment: so Christ was once offered to bear
" the sins of many; and unto them that look for
" him shall he appear the second time without sin
" unto salvation. For the Law, having a shadow
" of good things to come and not the very image of
" the things, can never with those sacrifices which
" they offered year by year continually make the

" comers

" comers thereunto perfect. For then, would they
" not have ceased to be offered? because that the
" worshippers once purged should have had no
" more conscience of sins. But in those sacrifices
" there is a remembrance again made of sins every
" year. For it is not possible, that the blood of
" bulls and of goats should take away sins. Where-
" fore, when he cometh into the world, he saith,
" Sacrifice and offering thou wouldest not, but a
" body hast thou prepared me; in burnt offerings
' and sacrifices for sin thou hast had no pleasure.
' Then said I, Lo, I come (in the volume of the
" book it is written of me) to do thy will, O God.
" Above, when he said, Sacrifice and offering and
" burnt offerings and offerings for sin thou wouldest
" not, neither hadst pleasure therein (which are
" offered by the Law); then said he, Lo, I come to
" do thy will, O God. He taketh away the first
" that he may establish the second. By the which
" will we are sanctified through the offering of the
" body of Jesus Christ once for all. And every
" priest standeth daily ministering and offering
" oftentimes the same sacrifices, which can never
" take away sins: but this man, after he had offer-
" ed one sacrifice for sins, for ever sat down on the
" right hand of God—For by one offering he hath
" perfected for ever them that are sanctified—Now,
" where remission of sins is, there is no more offer-

" ing for sin*." On this account it is said, that " Christ is *the end of the Law* for righteousness to " every one that believeth †." In him all the typical sacrifices under the Law were *perfected;* and to him, as its *completion*, the whole scheme of the Levitical dispensation referred. The Jews themselves indeed seem to have had an idea, that the sin-offerings would be perfected by the Messiah: Maimonides at least, in his *treatise on the red heifer*, mentions a curious tradition, which seems to involve some such idea, inasmuch as it represents the Messiah as *completing* an ordinance originally instituted under Moses. " Nine red heifers," says he, " have been sacrificed between the first delivering " of this precept and the desolation of the second " temple. Our master Moses sacrificed the first; " Ezra offered up the second; and seven more were " slain during the period which elapsed from the " time of Ezra to the destruction of the temple. The " tenth king Messiah himself will sacrifice. By his " speedy manifestation he will cause great joy. " Amen: may he come quickly ‡."

(3.) The third particular is *the making atonement for iniquity*.

* Heb. vii. 18, 19, 23, 24, 27. ix. 6—14, 22—28. x. 1—12, 14, 18.

† Rom. x. 4. ‡ Maimon. de vacca rufa. c. iii. p. 34.

This

This must relate to *the true atonement* made by the alone meritorious sacrifice of the Lamb of God. To *the typical atonement* it cannot relate; because the making of *that* was no way peculiar to the period of *the seventy weeks*. The typical atonement had equally been made, long before the commencement of *the seventy weeks*, from the days of Moses, not to say from the fall itself. This *making of atonement for iniquity* therefore must be something *peculiar* to *the seventy weeks;* something, that had never occurred before, and now for the first time takes place within the period of *the seventy weeks*, that is to say, either during their lapse or at their expiration. But to such a description *the atonement made by Christ himself* will alone be found to answer, and will alone be found to correspond with the dignity of the prophecy. Hence, the ministry of the Gospel is styled *the ministry of reconciliation;* and the Gospel itself, *the word of reconciliation.* Hence it is said, that God hath *reconciled* us to himself by Jesus Christ *. And hence the Messiah is described as being "a "merciful and faithful high-priest in things per- "taining to God, *to make reconciliation for the sins* "*of the people* †." In short, the whole of this mysterious transaction, of which the various reconciliations under the Law were only types, is thus amply set

* 2 Cor. v. 18—21. † Heb. ii. 17.

 forth

forth by the Apostle as accomplished under the Gospel. " When we were yet without strength, in " due time Christ died for the ungodly. For " scarcely for a righteous man will one die: yet " peradventure for a good man some would even " dare to die. But God commendeth his love to- " wards us, in that while we were yet sinners " Christ died for us. Much more then, being now " justified by his blood, we shall be saved from " wrath through him. For, if when we were ene- " mies *we were reconciled* to God by the death of " his Son, much more *being reconciled* we shall be " saved by his life. And not only so, but we also " joy in God through our Lord Jesus Christ, by " whom we have now received *the atonement* *.

(4.) The fourth particular is *to cause him who is the righteousness of the everlasting ages to come.*

That by this *righteousness* is meant *a person*, even *Messiah the prince that should come*, has already been shewn †. I apprehend, that *his coming* here spoken of specially means *his ministerial coming:* because, when Daniel afterwards descends to particulars, we are told, that *unto the Messiah*, by which I think we can only understand *unto his coming*, there shall be *weeks seven and weeks sixty and two.*

* Rom. v. 6. † According to the 10th abstract position.

(5.) The

(5.) The fifth particular is *the sealing of the vision and the prophet.*

In this expression there is a considerable degree of obscurity, arising from the various senses in which the verb *to seal* is used in Scripture. 1. Daniel employs it to describe the unintelligibleness of a prophecy on account of its not having yet received its accomplishment *. 2. Isaiah uses it to describe the same unintelligibleness of a vision though arising from a different cause, the spiritual stupidity of those who *might* have understood it †. 3. St. John and St. Paul use it to describe a formal authentication or acknowledgment: and the first of these apostles directly applies it to God's authentication of the ministry of Christ ‡. 4. Nehemiah and Jeremiah use it in the sense of ratifying any thing or making it sure §. 5. The Jews themselves employ it to de-

* Dan. xii. 9. See also Rev. v. vi.

† Isaian xxix. 9—18. It is probably used in the same sense in Isaiah viii. 16. where, instead of *seal the law among my disciples*, the LXX read *they that seal the law so that they understand it not*. Bp. Chandler thinks that they read מלמד *that it be not understood*, and approves this reading. See Bp. Lowth's Isaiah in loc. Such is the turn also St. Jerome gives it: Certe *lex et* " *prophetia usque ad Johannem* ligetur apud eos, et clausa sit " atque signata: ut, quod legunt, non intelligant." Comment. in loc.

‡ 2 Tim. ii. 19—2 Cor. i. 22.—Eph. i. 13. iv. 30—John vi. 27—Rev. ix. 4.

§ Nehem. ix. 35—Jerem. xxxii. 44.

note

note the finishing or completion of a work, a metaphor evidently borrowed from the sealing of a letter, because the sealing of it is a proof that it is finished*: but I cannot find, that it is used in this sense by any of the inspired writers, unless *perhaps* by the author of the book of Job †. Yet such is the meaning that Aquila ‡, the Vulgate §, and the Syriac ‖, ascribe to it. This interpretation however is somewhat ambiguous, and may be differently understood. *The finishing or completion of the vision and the prophet* may either mean *the accomplishment of the grand scheme of prophecy, and especially of this particular vision, in the person of Christ;* or it may mean *the finishing of the prophetic canon with Malachi, which took place in the course of the seventy weeks.* The former of these opinions has been adopted by Africanus, Cornelius a Lapide, Sir Isaac

* "Perficere, sive reipsa complere, vel ultimam manum imponere, ad finem perducere, concludere: ut v. g. Judæi hodie dicunt, tot vel tot annos transiisse להתימת תלמוד *a completo*, sive *absoluto, Talmud.*" Pol. Syn. in loc.

† Job ix. 7. xxxiii. 16. To the former of these passages the Bp. of Killalla gives a turn which renders the word incapable of bearing the sense of *completing;* and in the latter it is extremely doubtful whether such be its import.

‡ Τε τελεσαι ὁραματισμον και προφητην.

§ Impleatur visio et prophetia.

‖ Compleantur visio et prophetæ.

Newton

Newton, Dr. Prideaux, and others: whether the latter has ever been preferred, I know not*

In making our selection then among the different meanings which the verb *to seal* may be supposed to have, that, which naturally occurs the first, is *the unintelligibleness of the prophecy until it should have received its accomplishment:* and this interpretation is the more specious, because the verb is certainly used elsewhere in that very sense by Daniel himself†. Accordingly, it has been adopted by some commentators: but I greatly doubt, nevertheless, whether it be tenable. *A vision* may be so sealed; but it is hard to conceive, how *a prophet* can: and the original word signifies *a prophet*, not *a prophecy*, as our translators have rendered it. Besides, the vision of *the seventy weeks* would be unintelligible, not merely during the lapse of those *seventy weeks* (to which the unintelligibleness of the prophecy *must*, according to *this* interpretation, be limited); but from the very time of its being delivered (which was prior to the earliest possible date of *the seventy weeks* according to any *a priori* conjecture, namely the first year of Cyrus), to at least the termination

* As far as I can collect from Pole's Synopsis, Glassius seems to have had some such idea; but his meaning is not expressed very clearly.

† Dan. xii. 9.

of

of the Jewish war (which, if *the seventy weeks* be continuous, must necessarily be posterior to them from whatever era they are reckoned*), not to say to the final overthrow of the Roman empire at the close of the 1260 years †—The next meaning of the verb, which might possibly occur, is that, which the Jews and some of the ancient versions ascribe to it; namely, *the completion or finishing of the vision.* This I should not be unwilling to adopt in either of its modifications, if we had more satisfactory proof that the verb ever bore such a sense in *Scripture:* for, since, *the seventy weeks* are to bring both *the coming* and *the death of the Messiah,* they might well be said likewise to bring *the accomplishment of all the visions and of all the prophets*‡; or, since the prophetic canon under the Law closed with Malachi, they might equally be said to bring on *the finishing of it.* But, when the word can be interpreted in a perfectly unobjectionable manner agreeably to Scripture, I think it the most adviseable to

* The chronological untenableness of the hypothesis of Scaliger and Mr. Mede, which would make them end with the sacking of Jerusalem, has already been shewn.

† That the prophecy extends to the close of this famous period, will be shewn hereafter in the present chapter § VI. 3.

‡ "Omnium prophetarum scopus est Christus: hinc in Talmud sic scribunt, *Omnes prophetæ vaticinati sunt de diebus "Messiæ.*" Pol. Synop. in loc.

adopt

adopt such an interpretation—I conceive therefore, that *the sealing of the vision and the prophet* signifies *the authentication both of this numerical vision, and of all the other descriptive visions of the Old Testament, by their exact completion in the person of Christ*, on the one hand; and *the authentication of the great prophet, both by his perfectly fulfilling every vision respecting him, and by the miraculous attestation of his heavenly father to his divine commission*, on the other hand *. This seems to me the most natural and unobjectionable interpretation of the clause: and, in this sense, the vision and the prophet were manifestly sealed in the course of *the seventy weeks.*

(6.) The last particular is *the anointing of the Most Holy One.*

Under the Levitical dispensation, kings, priests, and prophets, were alike inaugurated into their respective offices by the ceremony of anointing †. Now, since our Lord is at once our king, our priest, and our prophet, he is figuratively said, in allusion to the ceremony under the Law, to have been anointed also at *his* inauguration into office. His

* Matt. iii. 16, 17. xvii. 5—Mark i. 10, 11. ix. 7—Luke i. ii. iii. 21, 22—John i. 31. xii. 28, 29, 30—Luke xxiv. 25, 26, 27—Heb. i—1 Peter i. 10, 11, 12—2 Peter i. 16—21.

† Levit. viii, 30—1 Kings xix, 16—2 Sam. ii. 4.

types

types were anointed only with consecrated oil: but God anointed *him* with the Holy Ghost and with power*. It seems most natural to suppose, that the spiritual ceremony of his unction ought to be considered as having been performed at his baptism. He possessed indeed the Spirit from his very *birth*†; and he was *born* a king‡, and a prophet§: but his solemn *inauguration* into his triple office took place at his baptism, when the Holy Ghost descended upon him in a bodily shape like a dove, and when a voice from heaven proclaimed him to be the beloved Son of God in whom he is well pleased‖. It was then that he was anointed with the Holy Ghost and with power. Previous to his baptism he performed no miracles: but immediately after it we find him manifesting forth his glory by the changing of water into wine ¶. Previous to his baptism he led a retired life of meditation and devotion: but immediately after it he began to act under his spiritual commission both of prophet, priest, and king**. As a prophet, he publicly applied to himself those words of Isaiah, "The Spirit

* Acts x. 38. † Luke i. 35. ‡ Matt. ii. 2.
§ Luke ii. 30, 31, 32. ‖ Luke iii. 21, 22. ¶ John ii. 11.

** Bp. Kidder thinks, that our Lord was twice anointed, first at his conception, and secondly at his baptism. It seems however most natural to ascribe his unction to the latter alone. Demons. of the Messiah. part I. chap. i. p. 11.

"of

" of the Lord is upon me, because he hath anoint-
" ed me to preach the Gospel to the poor: he hath
" sent me to heal the broken-hearted, to preach
" deliverance to the captives and recovering of
" sight to the blind, to set at liberty them that are
" bruised, to preach the acceptable year of the
" Lord*." As a priest, zealous for the honour of God and the purity of his worship, he authoritatively drove out of the temple those that profaned its courts by secular traffic, charging them not to make his father's house a house of merchandise †. And, as a king, he exercised supreme power both over the inanimate creation, the most inveterate diseases, and the evil spirits of darkness: insomuch that the multitude, astonished at what they saw, and fully acknowledging the justice of his claims to royalty, would, upon one occasion, have even taken him by force to make him a king ‡.

2. We have now considered the six particulars destined to be accomplished within the period of *the seventy weeks*. With some one or more of them these *seventy weeks* must necessarily terminate§: and they must plainly terminate with such as in point of chronology are *the latest*. Now the fourth particular, *the causing of the eternal righteousness to*

* Luke iv. 18, 19. † John ii. 13—17. ‡ John vi. 15.
§ According to the 2d abstract position.

come,

come, relates to *the advent of Christ*, and specially, I think, to *his ministerial advent*. The sixth particular, *the anointing of the Most High One*, and the commencement at least of the fifth particular, *the sealing of the vision and the prophet*, synchronize with *the baptism of Christ*. While the three first particulars, *the completion of the apostasy, the perfecting of the sin-offerings*, and *the making atonement for iniquity*, were all accomplished at *the crucifixion*. Hence it is manifest, that these three synchronical particulars are *the latest* in point of chronology, being *posterior* in their fulfilment to the other three. It will follow therefore, that *the seventy weeks* must expire with the fulfilment of them: that is to say, *the seventy weeks* must expire with *the crucifixion*. It is further manifest, that *the seventy weeks* cannot expire with *the siege of Jerusalem*, as some commentators have imagined: for not the least hint is given in any one of the six particulars, that *the siege of Jerusalem* is included within *the seventy weeks*. But we can scarcely suppose that so very striking an event would have been omitted in the enumeration, had it been included within *the seventy weeks;* more especially since, if it *be* included, it must mark their termination. Had it been the design of the Holy Spirit to connect *the siege of Jerusalem* with *the seventy weeks*, he would surely have added *two* more particulars to the *six* which

which are at present specified; he would surely have subjoined, *and to cause the sacrifice and meat-offering to cease, and to bring upon the border the abomination of desolation.* He is however totally silent upon this point; and teaches us, that *the seventy weeks* are the precise period to effect no more than *six* particulars, not one of which can be construed to have the least relation to the siege. It is plain therefore that *the seventy weeks* must end with the *latest* of these six particulars. But the three, which are jointly the latest, synchronize with *the crucifixion.* Consequently, *the seventy weeks* must terminate with *the crucifixion.*

Having thus ascertained their expiration, we must reckon back 490 years in order to arrive at their commencement. Now the crucifixion took place in the year 33 of the vulgar Christian era or the year 4746 of the Julian period, and at the time of the Passover which was always celebrated in the middle of the month *Nisan.* If from this era we reckon back 490 years, we shall be brought to the corresponding month *Nisan* in the year 458 before the Christian era or the year 4256 of the Julian period. But, in that very month of that very year Ezra received his commission to carry into effect the decree enacted by Artaxerxes Longimanus in the seventh year of his reign *. Hence it will follow,

* See the chronological table at the end of Chap. ii.

since

since the 490 years of *the seventy weeks* were thus accomplished even to a month at the time of the crucifixion, that the decree, from which they are to be calculated, must be the decree enacted by Artaxerxes Longimanus in the seventh year of his reign.

3. Here however the question will occur, *How is this arrangement consistent with the seventy weeks being the times of the holy city*?* Jerusalem began to be rebuilt from the first year of Cyrus, which considerably *preceded* the seventh year of Artaxerxes Longimanus, my supposed commencement of *the seventy weeks;* and was not destroyed until the year of our Lord 70, which considerably *succeeded* the era of the crucifixion. Therefore, according to the arrangement here proposed, *the seventy weeks* are plainly *not* the times of *the holy city.*

(1.) It is readily allowed that such is the case, if by *the holy city* we understand *the literal Jerusalem.* But I argue from this very circumstance, that *the literal Jerusalem* is *not* here intended. Since *the seventy weeks* certainly *are* the times of *the holy city,* and since the times of *the literal Jerusalem* are 605 years extending from the commencement of its rebuilding in the first year of Cyrus in the year A. C. 536 to its second demolition by the Romans in the year of our Lord 70; it will follow, that *the holy*

* According to the 4th abstract position.

city,

city, the times of which are limited to 490 years, cannot be *the literal city of Jerusalem.*

(2.) In order to establish this position, we must compare the prophecy with the edict. Now the prophecy teaches us, that we are to compute *the seventy weeks* from the going forth of an edict to rebuild Jerusalem: and it moreover teaches us to infer, that those *seventy weeks* expire with the *chronologically latest* of the six specified particulars *. Such being the case, they must inevitably expire with *the crucifixion:* and must therefore inevitably be reckoned from *the going forth of the edict in the seventh year of Artaxerxes.* Consequently, *the edict to rebuild Jerusalem alluded to in the prophecy* must be *the edict of the seventh year of Artaxerxes:* and *the city in the prophecy destined to be rebuilt* must be *the city the rebuilding of which is the subject of that edict.*

The words of the prophecy are: "Know and "understand, from the going forth of an edict to "rebuild Jerusalem unto the Anointed One the "Prince shall be weeks seven and weeks sixty and "two; it shall be rebuilt, with perpetual increase "and firm decision, even in the short space of the "times."

The words of the edict are: "Artaxerxes, king "of kings, unto Ezra the priest, a scribe of the law

* According to the 2d abstract position.

"of

" of the God of heaven, perfect peace, and at such
" a time. I make a decree, that all they of the
" people of Israel, and of his priests and Levites in
" my realm, which are minded of their own free
" will to go up to Jerusalem, go with thee. For-
" asmuch as thou art sent of the king and of his
" seven counsellors, to inquire concerning Judah
" and Jerusalem, according to the Law of thy God
" which is in thine hand; and to carry the silver
" and gold which the king and his counsellors have
" freely offered unto the God of Israel, whose habi-
" tation is in Jerusalem, and all the silver and gold
" that thou canst find in all the province of Babylon,
" with the free-will offering of the people and of the
" priests, offering willingly for the house of their
" God which is in Jerusalem: that thou mayest
" buy speedily with this money bullocks, rams,
" lambs, with their meat-offerings and their drink-
" offerings, and offer them upon the altar of the
" house of your God which is in Jerusalem. And,
" whatsoever shall seem good to thee and to thy
" brethren to do with the rest of the silver and the
" gold, that do after the will of your God. The
" vessels also that are given thee for the service of
" the house of thy God, those deliver thou before
" the God of Jerusalem. And whatsoever more
" shall be needful for the house of thy God, which
" thou shalt have occasion to bestow, bestow it out

" of the king's treasure-house. I, even I, Artax-
" erxes the king, do make a decree to all the trea-
" surers which are beyond the river, that whatso-
" ever Ezra the priest, the scribe of the Law of the
" God of heaven, shall require of you, it be done
" speedily; unto an hundred talents of silver, and
" to an hundred measures of wheat, and to an
" hundred baths of wine, and to an hundred baths
" of oil, and salt without prescribing how much.
" Whatsoever is commanded by the God of hea-
" ven, let it be diligently done for the house of the
" God of heaven: for why should there be wrath
" against the realm of the king and his sons? Also
" we certify you, that, touching any of the priests
" and Levites, singers, porters, Nethinim, or mi-
" nisters of this house of God, it shall not be law-
" ful to impose toll, tribute, or custom, upon them.
" And thou, Ezra, after the wisdom of thy God
" that is in thine hand, set magistrates, and judges,
" which may judge all the people that are beyond
" the river, all such as know the laws of thy God;
" and teach ye them that know them not. And
" whosoever will not do the Law of thy God and
" the Law of the king, let judgment be executed
" speedily upon him, whether it be unto death, or
" to banishment, or to confiscation of goods, or to
" imprisonment."

Now it is manifest, that in this edict there is not a word said respecting the reëdification of the *literal* city of Jerusalem. *That* had begun to be rebuilt in the first year of Cyrus: and, as for the temple, it had been finished in the sixth year of Darius *. As yet however neither the ecclesiastical nor the civil polity of Judah had regularly been reëstablished. Their full reëstablishment therefore is the subject of the present edict. By virtue of it Ezra was empowered to restore the observance of the Law of Moses both in church and state, to settle anew the temple service, to appoint magistrates and judges to govern the people, and to punish all such as should be disobedient to them according as their crimes deserved. Through his care, moreover, a correct edition of the holy Scriptures was set forth; the different books, of which they were composed, were collected together and properly arranged; and the sacred canon was fixed and settled. Whatever assistance he might have in this arduous and laborious undertaking, "the whole conduct of the "work, and the glory of accomplishing it, is by the "Jews chiefly attributed to him, under whose pre-"sidency, they tell us, it was done †." In short, from his being the great regenerator and restorer of

* Ezra vi. 15.

† Prideaux's Connection. Part i. b. v. p. 333.

their

their nation both ecclesiastically and civilly, " they " look on him as another Moses *. For, *the Law*, " they say, *was given by Moses, but it was revived* " *and restored by Ezra, after it had in a manner* " *been extinguished and lost in the Babylonish cap-* " *tivity:* and therefore they reckon him as the se- " cond founder of it. And it is a common opinion " among them, that he was Malachi the prophet†: " that he was called *Ezra* as his proper name, and " *Malachi* (which signifies *an angel* or *messenger*) " from his office; because he was sent, as the angel " and messenger of God, to restore again the Jew- " ish religion, and establish it in the same manner " as it was before the captivity, on the foundation " of the Law and the prophets. And indeed, by " virtue of that ample commission which he had " from king Artaxerxes, he had an opportunity of " doing more herein than any other of his nation: " and he executed all the powers thereof to the ut- " most he was able, for the resettling both of the " ecclesiastical and political state of the Jews, in " the best posture they were then capable of: and " from hence his name is in so high esteem and " veneration among the Jews, that it is a common

* Buxtorf. Tiberiad. c. 10.

† Abraham Zacutus in Juchasin. David Ganz. Chald. Paraph. in Malach. Buxtorf. Tiberiad. c. 3.

" saying among their writers, that, *if the Law had* " *not been given by Moses, Ezra was worthy by* " *whom it should have been given**."

The edict then of Artaxerxes relates, not to the rebuilding of *the literal Jerusalem,* but to the re-establishment of *the Levitical polity ecclesiastical and civil in communion with God. The holy city however mentioned in the prophecy* must be *the holy city the rebuilding of which is the subject of this edict;* because *this edict* is necessarily *the edict alluded to in the prophecy,* inasmuch as it was enacted precisely 490 years before the expiration of *the seventy weeks* at the crucifixion. Therefore *the holy city in the prophecy* must be *a figurative holy city,* namely *the Levitical polity so long as it continued holy unto God;* because no other city is mentioned, as being rebuilt, in the decree of Artaxerxes. And this interpretation of *the holy city in the prophecy,* to which we are led by the words of the decree, exactly accords with the period which is represented as being *the times of the holy city. Seventy weeks* are said to be the precise period upon it and upon Daniel's people. But upon the *literal* Jerusalem and Jewish nation *seventy weeks* were *not* the precise period: because 605 years elapsed between the commencement of the rebuilding of Jerusalem

* Prideaux's Connect. Part i. b. v. p. 333, 334.

and

and of the restoration of Judah, and the destruction of Jerusalem and the breaking of Judah as a nation. Whereas, if we interpret *the holy city* and *the people* agreeably to the tenor of the edict which was passed exactly 490 years before the crucifixion, we shall find that their appointed period was *precisely* seventy weeks of years. For just so long was the Levitical Church, after its restitution by Ezra, a city holy unto God; and just so long was the polity of Judah a theocracy. From that time, having completed their apostasy, and having finally rejected their divine ruler, the Jews ceased to be the peculiar people of God: and, instead of the Levitical Church, the Christian Church became his holy city. Such accordingly is the name bestowed upon it by St. John in the Apocalypse *.

(3.) This

* Rev. xi. 2. Mr. Marshall fully allows, that *the seventy weeks* are *the times of the holy city:* but, insisting upon it that *the holy city* means *the literal Jerusalem,* he thence takes occasion to say, that the interpretation of Dr. Prideaux, which in this particular I have followed, does *not* make *the seventy weeks* the times of the holy city, because it does not include within them the destruction of Jerusalem. This is most true, according to the sense in which *Mr. Marshall* understands *the holy city;* but *not* so, according to that in which *the Dean* and *myself* understand it. So far from it indeed, that I will venture to say, that the present exposition is the *only* one which *does* make *the seventy weeks* the times of the holy city. It is not a little singular, that Mr. Marshall should claim this praise for

his

(3.) This interpretation is required, not only by the tenor of the edict and by the specified times of the holy city which are limited to 490 years, but likewise by the context of the prophecy itself. Wherever *the city* is mentioned in the prophecy, *the holy city*, spoken of at the beginning of it, must be intended *. *The city therefore, which Messiah cuts off by divorce*, must be *the city destined to be rebuilt;* and *the city, destined to be rebuilt*, must be *the holy city*. But *the city, which Messiah divorces from being his mystical consort*, must plainly

his own system, when it so palpably fails of answering to the particular in question. He quite forgets, that *all* the period, which elapses between his supposed termination of *the sixty nine weeks* and his supposed commencement of *the seventieth week*, is equally the times of the *literal* Jerusalem as any part of *the seventy weeks;* for, during *the whole* of this intervening space, the city was standing. According to *his* hypothesis therefore, so far from 490 years (let him reckon those years as he pleases) being the times of the *literal* Jerusalem after its re-ëdification, its times amounted to no less than 514 years, even conceding to Mr. Marshall (what he has not proved) that it did not begin to be rebuilt until the twentieth year of Artaxerxes. In reality, it is utterly impossible to make 490 years the times of any other holy city than a *figurative* one: but of the *figurative* holy city, *the Levitical church in communion with God*, from its *reëstablishment* by Ezra to its *ceasing* to be the holy city by finally rejecting and crucifying the Messiah, 490 years are *exactly* the times. See Marshall's Treatise on the seventy weeks. p. 207.

* According to the 7th abstract position.

be

be *the Levitical church and polity;* not *the mere stones, timber, and mortar,* of which the *literal* Jerusalem was composed. Therefore *the holy city,* and *the city destined to be rebuilt,* must also be *the Levitical Church and polity.* The same conclusion may, I think, be drawn from the context of Daniel's prayer which introduces the prophecy. When he confesses the transgressions of Israel, as having called down the great judgments which had fallen upon the nation; when he laments the rebellions of his people, as having occasioned the entire dissolution of their polity; when he beseeches God that his anger and fury may be turned away from his city Jerusalem and his holy mountain, acknowledging that for the national iniquities Jerusalem and his people are become a reproach to all that are about them; when he prays to God, that he would cause his face to shine upon his desolate sanctuary and to look upon the city which is called by his name; and when he afterwards describes himself as having been confessing his sin and the sin of his people Israel, and as having been presenting his supplication before the Lord his God for the holy mountain of his God: it is scarcely possible to doubt, that he was lamenting the alienation and captivity of his people on account of their spiritual rebellions, that he was bewailing the dissolution of the Levitical church and state, and that he was

praying unto God for their speedy resettlement. Except as immediately connected with these great points, the desolation of the mere literal walls and houses of Jerusalem would scarcely have been made a subject of solemn prayer to God by such a truly spiritual believer as Daniel.

(4.) It is however a safe and obvious method of establishing the meaning of a passage which is in any degree ambiguous, to compare it with other parallel passages respecting the import of which there can be no dispute. *One* restoration of Judah is past: but *another* is as yet future. It may be useful therefore, for the settling the right interpretation of the present passage, to inquire whether the prophets use any phraseology to depict *the future reëstablishment of Judah* similar to that, which I conceive Daniel here to use for the purpose of depicting *the past reëstablishment of the Levitical polity in both its branches* by the ministration of Ezra and his successor Nehemiah. Analogy, it is true, is not mathematical evidence: but, when it exactly tallies with the conclusion drawn from other arguments, it is not to be slighted. Now *the reëstablishment of Judah in the last ages* is described under the very same imagery as that which Daniel here uses to describe *the resettling of the Levitical polity ecclesiastical and civil after the return from Babylon*. "Again I will build thee, and thou shalt

"be

" be built, O virgin of Israel *—I will cause the
" captivity of Judah and the captivity of Israel to
" return, and will build them as at the first †—In
" that day will I raise up the tabernacle of David
" that is fallen, and close up the breaches thereof;
" and I will raise up his ruins, and I will build it as
" in the days of old ‡—The sons of strangers shall
" build up thy walls, and their kings shall minister
" unto thee: for in my wrath I smote thee, but in
" my favour have I had mercy on thee. Therefore
" thy gates shall be open continually: they shall
" not be shut day nor night—The sons also of them
" that afflicted thee shall come bending unto thee:
" —they shall call thee the city of the Lord, the
" Zion of the Holy One of Israel—For brass I will
" bring gold, and for iron I will bring silver, and for
" wood brass, and for stones iron:—thou shalt call
" thy walls Salvation, and thy gates Praise §—O
" thou afflicted, tossed with tempest, and not com-
" forted, behold I will lay thy stones with fair co-
" lours, and lay thy foundations with sapphires.
" And I will make thy windows with agates, and
" thy gates of carbuncles, and all thy borders of
" pleasant stones ‖." Now, since in these various passages, to which others might easily have been

* Jerem. xxxi. 4. † Jerem. xxxiii. 7. ‡ Amos ix. 11.
§ Isaiah lx. 10, 11, 14, 17, 18. ‖ Isaiah liv. 11, 12.

added,

added, *the yet future reëstablishment of Judah* is described under the imagery of *rebuilding Jerusalem*, it seems most agreeable to prophetic analogy to conclude, even independent of the arguments which have already been adduced, that the very same imagery of *rebuilding Jerusalem* here employed by Daniel relates, not to *the rebuilding of the literal city*, but to *the reëstablishment of the Levitical polity*. So familiar indeed was this imagery to the Jews, that the writers of the New Testament, adopting it from their predecessors, apply it exactly in the same sense both to *the establishment of the Christian Church here*, and to *its final complete settlement hereafter* *.

On these grounds then (briefly to recapitulate what has been said) I am induced to follow Dr. Prideaux in supposing, that *the holy city destined to be rebuilt* does not mean *the literal Jerusalem*, but *the whole Levitical polity so long as it continued holy unto God from its reëstablishment by Ezra in the seventh year of Artaxerxes*. 1. The times of this *holy city* are 490 years: but 490 years are *not* the times of *the literal Jerusalem:* therefore *the literal Jerusalem* cannot be *the holy city* intended. 2. The 490 years expire with the crucifixion: therefore the times of

* See 1 Cor. iii. 10. Ephes. ii. 19—22. Jude 20. Heb. ix. 11. xi. 10. Rev. xxi.

the

the holy city expire with the crucifixion: consequently they commence with the decree of Artaxerxes enacted precisely 490 years before the crucifixion. This being the case, *the holy city* itself must be *the holy city which is the subject of that decree.* But *the holy city, the rebuilding of which is the subject of that decree,* is *a figurative holy city.* Therefore *the holy city in the prophecy* must be *a figurative holy city.* And this conclusion is established by the circumstance of the times of *the figurative holy city* being exactly 490 years: for the Levitical polity continued to be a city holy unto God from its restoration by Ezra to the day of the crucifixion, when it ceased to be the holy city of God. 3. *The holy city destined to be rebuilt* is plainly *the city which Messiah should divorce:* but *the city to be divorced* is *a figurative city:* therefore *the city to be rebuilt* is also *a figurative city.* 4. The allegorical phraseology, *supposed* in this exposition to be used in describing the first restoration of Judah, is perfectly analogous to that, which is *allowed* to be used in describing his final restoration.

II. But know and understand, from the going forth of an edict to rebuild Jerusalem unto the Anointed One the Prince shall be weeks seven and weeks sixty and two: it shall be rebuilt, with perpetual increase

INCREASE AND FIRM DECISION, EVEN IN THE SHORT SPACE OF THE TIMES.

1. Having ascertained the termination and therefore the commencement of *the seventy weeks*, we proceed to consider the smaller periods into which they are subdivided.

(1.) *The seventy weeks* being continuous, the smaller periods of which they are composed must be continuous likewise*. Hence *the seven weeks* and *the sixty two weeks*, which bring us unto Messiah the Prince, are equivalent to *sixty nine weeks;* though a double mode of notation is used, because the rebuilding of the holy city was to be completed *in the short space of the times*, that is to say, in *the seven weeks*. But *sixty nine prophetic weeks* are equal to 483 years. If then we compute 483 years from the date of the edict passed by Artaxerxes Longimanus in the year A. C. 458 and in the year 4256 of the Julian period, we shall be brought to the year 26 of the Christian era and the year 4739 of the Julian period. In this year therefore, since *the seventy weeks* must expire with the crucifixion, we are directed to look for *the coming of the Messiah* intended by Daniel, when he teaches us, that from the going forth of the edict there should be *sixty nine weeks* unto the Anointed One the Prince.

* According to the 6th abstract position.

The

The coming of the Messiah however must mean either *his natural coming at his birth*, or *his official coming in his ministry*. The *former* it cannot mean, because it is placed only seven years before his death: therefore it must mean the *latter*.

The question then is, *when* our Lord is considered in Scripture as coming officially in his ministry. Now, that the ministry of the Gospel did not commence with his own personal preaching, but with the previous preaching of his harbinger John the Baptist, he himself expressly declares: "the "Law and the prophets were *until* John; *since* "*that time* the kingdom of God is preached, and "every man presseth into it*." *Unto the Messiah* therefore means *unto the commencement of the Gospel dispensation*, precisely as *unto Moses* means *unto the commencement of the Levitical dispensation by the promulging of the Law*†: and the Gospel dispensation commenced with the preaching of John the Baptist. Consequently we must look for the beginning of John's preaching seven years before the crucifixion, or in the year 4739 of the Julian period.

According to St. Luke, the ministry of John commenced in the fifteenth year of Tiberius Cesar‡,

* Luke xvi. 16. † See Rom. v. 13, 14.

‡ Luke iii. 1, 2.

But there are two epochs, from either of which the years of Tiberius may be reckoned. The one is the time, when, according to Velleius Paterculus, Tacitus, and Suetonius, he was admitted by Augustus into a copartnership of the empire and had an equal power in the government of the provinces conferred upon him by law*: the other is the time, when, by the death of Augustus, he became sole emperor. The point therefore to be considered is, *which* of these epochs is adopted by St. Luke as the time whence he reckons the fifteenth year of Tiberius.

Now, as Abp. Usher observes, Tiberius was admitted into a copartnership of the empire in the year 4725 of the Julian period, and succeeded to the sole empire in the year 4728 of the same period. Consequently, his fifteenth year, reckoned from the first of these epochs, coincides with the Julian year 4739; and, reckoned from the second,

* Vell. Pat. l. ii. c. 120—Tac. Annal. l. i. c. 1—Suet. in Tiber. c. 21. The testimony of Paterculus is very strong to the purpose. "Concussis hostium viribus, classicis peditumque expeditionibus, cum res Galliarum maximæ molis, accensasque plebis Viennensium dissensiones, coercitione, magis quam pœna, mollisset (Tiberius), et Senatus Populusque Romanus, postulante patre ejus (Augusto), *ut æquum ei jus in omnibus provinciis exercitibusque esset quam erat ipsi*, decreto complexus esset;—in urbem reversus, jam pridem debitum, sed continuatione bellorum dilatum, ex Pannoniis Dalmatisque egit triumphum."

with

with the Julian year 4742. One or other of these years therefore must be that fifteenth year of his reign, which is specified by St. Luke as the era of the beginning of John's ministry.

I think with Dr. Prideaux that it must be the *former* of them: and I assent to his opinion on the following grounds.

It has been proved, as far as matters of this kind are capable of proof, that *the seventy weeks* must expire with the crucifixion. It has also been proved, that *unto the Messiah* means *unto the commencement of the Gospel dispensation*, and that the Gospel dispensation commenced with the preaching of John. If then these points have been proved, John must have begun to preach at the end of *the sixty nine weeks:* that is to say, as we have seen above, he must have begun to preach in the Julian year 4739, when *the sixty nine weeks* expired. But this very year 4739 is the fifteenth year of Tiberius reckoned from his admission into a copartnership of the empire. Hence, if the premises be well established, the conclusion must be, that it is *this* fifteenth year of which St. Luke speaks as being the year in which John began to preach.

We shall be led to the same conclusion by the internal evidence afforded in the history itself. If the ministry of John commenced in the *other* fifteenth year of Tiberius, it must have commenced three

three years later: in which case, it must have commenced only a very few months before the baptism of Christ. But that is too short a space of time for the fame of John to have been spread far and wide, as we are assured by the sacred historians that it was, not merely before his *death*, but even before he *baptized* our Lord *. If then John could not have begun to preach in the fifteenth year of the *sole* reign of Tiberius, he must have begun in the fifteenth year *reckoned from the admission of that prince into a copartnership of the empire;* because there is no *other* year in which he *could* have begun.

The propriety of the conclusion seems to be further confirmed by the style adopted in the public acts of the empire. From the time when Tiberius was associated into the government, these went in his name as well as in that of Augustus; and the usage especially prevailed in the imperial provinces, of which Syria was one. From that time therefore the years of his reign were reckoned in those provinces. Whence it is natural to conclude, that St. Luke followed the ordinary mode of computation; and, consequently, that his fifteenth year of Tiberius coincides with the Julian year 4739 †.

* See Matt. iii. 1—13—Mark i. 2—9—Luke iii. 1—22.

† See Prideaux's Connect. Part i. B. v. p. 303.

Thus

Thus it appears, that *the sixty nine weeks*, which it was predicted should reach *unto the Messiah*, if reckoned from the seventh year of Artaxerxes Longimanus, bring us exactly to the year 4739 of the Julian period or the fifteenth year of Tiberius, in which the Gospel dispensation commenced by the preaching of our Lord's harbinger John the Baptist.

(2.) This arrangement of St. Luke's fifteenth year of Tiberius, when proposed by Dr. Prideaux, was violently objected to by Mr. Marshall: but the Dean was prevented by death from answering the arguments of his opponent; he was removed from this life, while the work in which he was attacked was yet in the press.

Mr. Marshall objects first and most vehemently, that Dr. Prideaux sets aside the authority of Ptolemy, notwithstanding he had spoken so strongly in favour of his canon, and notwithstanding he had himself censured Petavius and Abp. Usher for throwing back the commencement of the reign of Artaxerxes Longimanus ten or nine years in defiance of that canon. The Julian year 4739, according to the canon of Ptolemy, is the twelfth year of Tiberius: whereas, according to the Dean's reckoning, it is his fifteenth year.

Such an objection promises much, but performs little. I will venture flatly to deny, that Dr. Prideaux

deaux does in this instance at all set aside the canon of Ptolemy. It is well known, that that writer *uniformly* computes the years of each sovereign from the death of his predecessor. According to *this* reckoning, Dr. Prideaux never denied, nor ever thought of denying, that the Julian year 4739 coincided with the twelfth year of Tiberius. But, though the computation of *Ptolemy* be *uniform*, it does not exclude the existence of *other* modes of computation. Thus, in the case of Tiberius, the years of his reign are reckoned from two different epochs. Ptolemy, agreeably to his fixed plan, calculates them from the death of Augustus: but they are likewise calculated from his admission into a copartnership of the empire. Between these two modes of computation there is a difference of three years: so that, according to one of them, the Julian year 4739 coincides with the fifteenth year of Tiberius; and, according to the other, with his twelfth year. When an historian therefore speaks of the fifteenth year of this prince, it is abstractedly a matter of doubt *which* fifteenth year he speaks of: but, if there be reason to suppose that he speaks of his fifteenth year reckoned from his admission into a copartnership of the empire, I see not how the adopting of such a supposition can at all be construed into a rejection of the authority of Ptolemy—But the futility of this objection will better appear from considering

considering other parallel cases. 1. Jeremiah speaks of the first year of Nebuchadnezzar *, and Daniel speaks of his second year †: yet no one doubts, nor did Mr. Marshall himself doubt, that these prophets use two different modes of reckoning. Jeremiah computes from the admission of Nebuchadnezzar into a copartnership of the empire: whence *his* first year of Nebuchadnezzar does not coincide with *Ptolemy's* first year of that prince or the Julian year 4110, but with the twentieth year of Nabopollassar or the Julian year 4108. But Daniel computes, like Ptolemy, from the death of Nabopollassar and the accession of Nebuchadnezzar to sole empire: whence *his* second year of Nebuchadnezzar coincides of course with *Ptolemy's* second year of the same prince. Are we then to be told that we set aside the authority of the canon, because we assert, that *Jeremiah's* first year of Nebuchadnezzar is not *Ptolemy's* first year of Nebuchadnezzar, but that it coincides with *Ptolemy's* twentieth year of Nabopollassar? Mr. Marshall *himself* asserts this very point, and no doubt justly; it is a matter generally acknowledged: yet, on the same ground, does he with equal vehemence and inconsistency, exclaim against Dr. Prideaux for his arrangement of St. Luke's fifteenth year of Tiberius.

* Jerem. xxv. 1. † Dan. ii. 1.

The cases are perfectly parallel. Nebuchadnezzar and Tiberius were alike admitted into a participation of empire before the deaths of their respective predecessors: hence their reigns are alike computed by a double reckoning. Mr. Marshall admits, that, in the case of Nebuchadnezzar, *Jeremiah* follows one mode of reckoning, and *Ptolemy* another: but, when Dr. Prideaux asserts, on what appeared to himself very sufficient grounds (of their sufficiency the reader must judge), that *St. Luke*, like *Jeremiah*, follows a mode of reckoning different from that of *Ptolemy*, Mr. Marshall immediately assails him as an impugner of the astronomical canon. 2. The same remark may be made respecting the first year of Cyrus. None suppose that the first year of that prince according to *Scripture* and *Xenophon* is the same as his first year according to *Ptolemy*, except indeed Mr. Lancaster, whom Mr. Marshall justly censures on this very account: all know, that it is the same as his third year according to *Ptolemy*. But is the maintaining of this opinion to be called an impeachment of the veracity of the canon? If it be, the Dean, had he lived, might well have retorted upon his incautious assailant the charge of chronological delinquency—After what has been said, it seems almost idle to point out the palpable difference between Mr. Marshall's accusation of the Dean, and the Dean's accusation of Petavius and

Abp.

Abp. Usher. The Dean produces his authority for the assumption of Tiberius into a share of the government and for the computation of his years from that assumption: Petavius, without a shadow of authority, conjectures that Artaxerxes was admitted into a copartnership of the empire about ten years *before* the death of his father; while the Primate, in absolute defiance of the canon, *throws back* that death the space of about nine years.

Mr. Marshall next objects, that a much shorter period than three years and a half was sufficient very widely to have extended the fame of John the Baptist, and that John acted in his ministry after our Lord had entered upon *his*.

All this may be perfectly true; but it seems to me to bear very little upon the point in debate. The question is not, how long a time might be deemed sufficient to make the Baptist known through a very extensive region, nor how long a time he might carry on his ministry conjointly with our Lord: but, whether a very few months previous to the baptism of Christ were sufficient to have spread his fame in every direction. If they were not, he could not have begun to preach in *Ptolemy's* fifteenth year of Tiberius: and, if he did not begin to preach *then*, he must have begun in the fifteenth year of Tiberius according to the *other* reckoning which coincides with his twelfth year according to Ptolemy;

Ptolemy; because there is no third intermediate fifteenth year in which he *could* have begun.

He lastly objects, that both Josephus and Eusebius reckon the years of Tiberius agreeably to the canon of Ptolemy: whence he infers, that it is next to a certainty that St. Luke did the same.

The cogency of this objection will best appear by the application of the argument on which it is founded to a case which has already been adduced. *Daniel reckons the years of Nebuchadnezzar agreeably to the canon of Ptolemy: therefore it is next to a certainty, that Jeremiah did the same.* So might we reason abstractedly with as much plausibility as Mr. Marshall does, but we should reason with just as little demonstrative evidence. If Daniel's computation according to the canon will not prove that Jeremiah used the same mode of computation (and we know that he did *not* use the same mode), it is difficult to conceive why the reckoning of St. Luke must necessarily have been the same as the reckoning of Josephus and Eusebius*.

2. *The*

* Marshall's Treatise on the lxx weeks. p. 182—198. As some might be inclined to think, that Dr. Prideaux and myself wish to compute the fifteenth year of Tiberius, mentioned by St. Luke, from the time of his admission into an equal share of the government, merely to serve a turn; it may be useful to mention, that both the author of the preface to the *Rationarium* of Petavius, and other chronological writers whom he notices, contend,

2. *The sixty nine weeks* are divided into *seven weeks* and *sixty two weeks:* and we are told, that the holy city is to be rebuilt, with perpetual increase and firm decision, in the short space of the times, or in *the seven weeks.* Seven prophetic weeks however are equal to forty nine years: and *the seven weeks,* being the first term of *the seventy weeks,* must be computed from the same era; that is to say, they must be computed from the seventh year of Artaxerxes Longimanus. If then they be computed from this year, which synchronizes with the year A. C. 458 and with the year 4256 of the Julian period, they will expire in the year A. C. 409 and in the year 4305 of the Julian period. Here therefore we must look for the completion of the rebuilding of the figurative holy city; by which can only be understood its ultimate reformation and resettlement. Now the last act of reform, that took place under the administration of Nehemiah the successor of Ezra, was the final removal of unlawful marriages from among the people*. The Law of Moses strictly prohibited all intermarriages of

contend, *without having any system of prophetic interpretation to maintain,* that that year must *necessarily* be *so* computed, and not from the commencement of his *sole* reign. Dissert. poster. c. iii. apud præfat. in edit. Genev. Petav. Ration. Temp.

* It is recorded in Nehem. xiii. 23—31.

every

every sort with any foreign nation *: but, subsequent to the restoration from Babylon, this prohibition was very little regarded by the Jews. It is probable, that they first infringed the Law during their captivity, and that they brought back with them the forbidden practice into their own country. When Ezra came to Jerusalem, he found it very prevalent among them †: and, though for a time he had checked it, yet the same corrupt practice had again sprung up when Nehemiah succeeded him ‡. Upon this the new governor caused all the people to enter into a covenant with God, and to bind themselves by a solemn oath and imprecation "to "walk in God's Law which was given by Moses "the servant of God, and to observe and do all "the commandments of the Lord and his judg-"ments and his statutes §;" among which was particularly specified the prohibition of strange marriages ‖. Afterwards, a short time subsequent to his last return to his government, with the view apparently of preventing any relapse into the same forbidden practice, he separated all the mixed multitude from the children of Israel ¶. Yet even this did not wholly eradicate the evil: for it grew up

* Exod. xxxiv. 16—Deut. vii. 3.
† Ezra ix. x.
‡ Nehem. x. 30.
§ Nehem. x. 29.
‖ Nehem. x. 30.
¶ Nehem. xiii. 1, 2, 3.

again,

again*; and at length attained to such a height, that the family of the high-priest, which of all others ought to have been careful in preserving itself pure from such prohibited connections, was polluted with them†. One of the sons of Joiada the high-priest, whose name Nehemiah does not mention, but whom Josephus calls *Manasseh*‡, married the daughter of Sanballat the Horonite. Justly apprehensive of the mischievous effects of such an example, and finding that Manasseh was unwilling to part with his strange wife, Nehemiah exerted his authority to the utmost, and banished him from the country. The refractory priest fled into Samaria with many others who were in the same predicament, and settled there under the protection of Sanballat the governor. This was the last act of reformation that was found necessary in order to bring back the revived Levitical Church to the model of the primitive one as constituted by Moses: and Nehemiah represents himself, as having completed his labours, in the following words: "Thus "cleansed I them from all strangers, and appoint- "ed the wards of the priests and the Levites, every "one in his business; and for the wood-offering,

* Nehem. xiii. 23—27. † Nehem. xiii. 28.
‡ Antiq. lib. xi. c. 7. § 2.

"at

" at times appointed; and for the first fruits: re-
" member me, O my God. for good *."

It is not to be dissembled, that the precise year, in which this final act of reformation took place, and in which consequently the figurative rebuilding of the holy city was finished, cannot be ascertained from *history*. Yet it can be shewn, that the epoch of it must be placed *about* the time where we are led by the prophecy to place it; because it can be shewn, that it must be placed not long after the eleventh year of Darius Nothus. Nehemiah tells us, that the high-priest, whose son married the daughter of Sanballat, was Joiada the son of Eliashib †. But, according to the Chronicon Alexandrinum, which gives the most exact account of the succession of the high-priests from the Babylonian captivity to the times of the Seleucian kings, Joiada succeeded his father in the high-priesthood in the year which corresponds with the eleventh year of Darius Nothus, with the year A. C. 413, and with the year 4301 of the Julian period; as is manifest from the number of years, which this Chronicle ascribes to each high-priest ‡. Now from the year 4256 of the Julian period, in which the decree of the seventh year of Artaxerxes was enacted, to the year

* Nehem. xiii. 30, 31. † Nehem. xiii. 28.

‡ See the chronological table in the Appendix, No. 2.

4301 of the same period, there are forty-five years. Consequently, Joiada must have succeeded to the high-priesthood forty-five years after the enacting of the decree from which *the seven weeks* are to be computed. Hence it is manifest, since the last act of Nehemiah's reformation took place in the high-priesthood of Joiada, that it must have taken place *more* than forty-five years after the enacting of the decree. *How much* more, *history* does not enable us positively to determine: *four years more*, if my view of *the prophecy* be just. For, if *the seventy weeks* expire with the crucifixion (as they must do if they look *prospectively*), and if consequently they commence in the seventh year of Artaxerxes Longimanus; then the edict for the rebuilding of the holy city must be an edict for the rebuilding of the figurative holy city. And, if the edict for the rebuilding of the holy city be the edict for the rebuilding of the figurative holy city, which was passed in the seventh year of Artaxerxes; then the forty-nine years, allotted for its rebuilding, must expire in the year 4305 of the Julian period, which synchronizes with the fifteenth year of Darius Nothus and with the fifth year of the high-priesthood of Joiada. And, if the rebuilding of the holy city be completed by the last act of Nehemiah's reformation (as it must be, if *the figurative holy city* be meant); then his last act of reformation must be fixed to the year

4305

4305 of the Julian period. This, accordingly, is *about* the time where we *must* fix it; because, since it took place in the high-priesthood of Joiada, and since Joiada succeeded to the high-priesthood four years before the supposed expiration of *the seven weeks*, it cannot have taken place *earlier* than forty five years after the enacting of the decree.

(1.) But here it may be objected, that Nehemiah's last act of reformation did *not* take place in the high-priesthood of *Joiada*, but in that of his father *Eliashib;* the word *high-priest* standing in apposition with *Eliashib*, not with *Joiada:*—"one of "the sons of Joiada the son of Eliashib the high-"priest was son-in-law to Sanballat the Horo-"nite*."

I reply, that, if the last act of Nehemiah's reformation took place in the high-priesthood of Eliashib, the marriage of the son of Joiada must also have taken place in the same high-priesthood: that is to say, the son of Joiada must have been married in the high-priesthood, and consequently in the lifetime, of his grandfather. But this is improbable *generally*, because it very rarely happens that a grandson is married during the life of his grandfather. And it is still more improbable (I had almost said impossible) *particularly*, because the

* Nehem. xiii. 28.

members

members of the sacerdotal family usually married later in life than the laity, and because the high-priesthoods of Joiakim and Eliashib and Joiada were each so long that Manasseh scarcely *could* have been married in the life-time of his grandfather Eliashib—I likewise reply, that the idiom of the Hebrew language will not admit of such a construction, as that which would place the word *high-priest* in apposition with *Eliashib.* The Jews, and other eastern nations, not having adopted the use of surnames, were accustomed to distinguish one person from another who bore the same name by subjoining the name of his father or some more remote ancestor of celebrity: *Joiada the son of Eliashib* therefore is in fact one name, expressed by the Hebrews *Joiada Ben-Eliashib.* The same custom alike prevailed among the Welsh, the Irish, the Scots, and the Normans. Many of those names, which are now become regular surnames, were originally patronymics, and were changed every generation. Thus, as Manasseh the son of Joiada Ben-Eliashib would call himself *Manesseh Ben-Joiada,* so, among the Normans, Robert the son of William Fitz-Eustace, would formerly have been designated *Robert Fitz-William.*

(2.) It may further be objected, that this arrangement does not accord with the chronology of Josephus: because he says, that the *Manasseh,* who

espoused the daughter of Sanballat, was the brother of Jaddua the grandson of Joiada, and the son of Johanan; and that his marriage took place during the high-priesthood of Jaddua*.

To this I reply, that, supposing the same *Sanballat* to be spoken of by Nehemiah and Josephus (which indeed is sufficiently evident†,) the chronology of Josephus must necessarily have been rendered erroneous by his mistaking *Darius Codomannus* for *Darius Nothus*. Jaddua succeeded to the high-priesthood in the year A. C. 341 towards the end of the reign of Artaxerxes Ochus, and was

* Perhaps it is not *quite* clear that Josephus says the whole of this, but I thought it right to put the objection in the strongest form. He does not *absolutely* say, that Manasseh married the daughter of Sanballat in the high-priesthood of Jaddua, though such seems the most natural construction of the passage.

† It is incredible, that in the course of two or three generations there should be *two* Sanballats, whose lives should be marked by exactly the same circumstances, the *Sanballat* of Scripture and the *Sanballat* of Josephus; that *each* should be governor of Samaria, that *each* should have a daughter married to a son of the Jewish high-priest, and that for the offence of contracting such a marriage the son-in-law of *each* should be banished his country. But, if the *Sanballat* of Josephus be the *Sanballat* of Scripture, then the *Manasseh* of Josephus must be the person who is said in Scripture to have married the daughter of Sanballat and to have been the son of Joiada, though his name is not mentioned.

contemporary

contemporary with Darius Codomannus and Alexander the great. If then Manasseh married the daughter of Sanballat during the high-priesthood of Jaddua, he must have married her, and have been banished by Nehemiah for his offence, subsequent to the year A. C. 341. But Nehemiah received his commission in the twentieth year of Artaxerxes Longimanus in the year A. C. 445; at which time, from the importance of the trust committed to him, we cannot suppose him to have been less than thirty years of age, probably much more. Allowing him however to have been no more than thirty years of age in the year A. C. 445 when he received his commission, he must have been one hundred and thirty-four years old in the year A. C. 341 when Jaddua succeeded to the high-priesthood; and he must have been of a yet more advanced age, when he banished Manasseh on account of his unlawful marriage. But such a supposition, which must be adopted, if we adopt the chronology of Josephus, and if we assume that, when Nehemiah speaks of *the sons* of Joiada*, he uses the word *sons* in a large sense, meaning *grandsons:* such a supposition, considering the age of man which was not longer in those days than it is at present, is altogether improbable †.

* Nehem. xiii. 28.

† See Prideaux's Connect. Part i. b. 6. p. 424—427.

(3.) To

(3.) To this termination however of *the seven weeks* Mr. Marshall objects, both on the score of its being *improbable* that Nehemiah's last act of reformation should have taken place so late, and on the score of the *insufficiency* of the argument adduced to prove that it was accomplished in the high-priesthood of *Joiada* rather than in that of his father *Eliashib*.

The first of these objections I think sufficiently answered by stating *the counter-improbability* of Eliashib, during his life-time, having a grandson of a sufficient age to be married. The high-priesthood of Joiakim lasted 30 years; that of Eliashib, 40 years; and that of Joiada, 40 years likewise. Now it is obvious, that, where an office descends from father to son, three successive reigns could not have been so long, unless the high-priests had married *late in life:* for, whenever there is a series of *early* marriages, though *one* reign may be very long, the *next* must be proportionably short. But, if the high-priests married late in life, or (to be more particular) if *Eliashib* the high-priest in question married late in life, as he must have done both to reign 40 years *himself* and to have *a son* reign 40 years after him; it is not very probable, that *a grandson* of his could have attained the marriageable age during *his* high-priesthood. The question therefore is, whether it be *more probable*, that Nehemiah's last act

act of reformation took place when it is supposed to have done, or that Eliashib, who reigned 40 years himself, whose father reigned 30 years before him, and whose son reigned 40 years after him, should have lived to see the marriage of his grandson. I do not say, that such a thing is *impossible;* but, whether it be a more *probable* event than the supposed late act of Nehemiah's reformation, let the reader determine.

If the weight of *probability* be against Mr. Marshall, his second objection will be of very little avail. Indeed it is urged in a manner, which seems to shew that its author did not consider himself as treading on very firm ground. He allows, that, according to " the usual eastern mode of writing," when the expression *Joiada the son of Eliashib the high-priest* occurs, we are to understand it as denoting that *Joiada,* not *Eliashib,* is the high-priest spoken of: but he thinks, that we have no right to infer that such is its import *as used by Nehemiah;* because, when that writer speaks of *Eliashib,* he simply calls him *Eliashib the priest* or *Eliashib the high-priest,* not *Eliashib the son of Joiakim the high-priest*—The weight of this *negative* argument cannot be esteemed to be very great, when used to invalidate an acknowledged *affirmative* proposition. If it be allowed, that, according to " the usual eas-" tern mode of writing," the expression *Joiada the*

son of Eliashib the high-priest denotes *Joiada* to be the high-priest in question, it is difficult to conceive the cogency of the argument, which would prove, that a writer uses the expression in a sense *different* from the usual eastern mode of writing, because he sometimes does not use it *at all.* In short Mr. Marshall's objective argument amounts to this: according to "the usual eastern mode of writing," the expression *Joiada the son of Eliashib the high-priest* imports that *Joiada* is the high-priest spoken of; Nehemiah however writes *Eliashib the high-priest*, and not *Eliashib the son of Joiakim the high-priest;* THEREFORE, when he writes *Joiada the son of Eliashib the high-priest*, he means to speak of *Eliashib*, not of *Joiada*, as being high-priest, though according to the acknowledged usual eastern mode of writing we ought to understand exactly *the reverse.*

It may not be amiss to remark, that, although Mr. Marshall objects so heavily to Dr. Prideaux, his own supposition that the rebuilding of the literal Jerusalem was completed in 49 years is purely conjectural.

Thus, though I allow that it cannot be absolutely proved from history that Nehemiah's last act of reformation took place precisely *forty nine years* after the enacting of the decree in the seventh year of Artaxerxes, we may, I think, fairly conclude from the

the prophecy itself viewed in connection with what *can* be proved from history, that its true date is the expiration of those *forty nine years.*

3. We are told, that, during the short space of *the seven weeks* the rebuilding of the figurative city is to be carried on *with perpetual increase and firm decision*—The first of these expressions plainly relates to its being gradually built up to the purity of the original model. Ezra did much both towards reëstablishing it, and towards removing various abuses which had crept in: Nehemiah completed the whole in every respect. But, if we read the history of those transactions, it will evidently appear that the business was accomplished gradually. First one institution was appointed and one abuse removed, and then another: until at length, at the end of forty nine years, that forbidden practice which seems to have been the most inveterate was finally eradicated, and the rebuilding of the city finished—The second expression seems intended to describe the character of those, who were the chief agents in this great work. If we consider the various difficulties that Ezra and Nehemiah had to encounter, we shall be convinced that it required no ordinary degree of firmness and decision to prosecute with steadiness and resolution the business committed to them. Every impediment was thrown in their way by the Samaritans, the Ammonites, the

Arabians, and the Ashdodites, insomuch that the people were compelled to labour with a weapon in one of their hands. But outward opposition may be considered as trifling compared to that from within. The work of reformation is never popular. The Jews returned again and again to the contracting of forbidden marriages and to the open violation of the sabbath. Even the son of the high-priest sanctioned the first of these abuses by his own example. Insomuch that all Nehemiah's promptitude and decision of character were not more than sufficient for the inflicting of punishment upon so exalted an offender, and for the stemming of such a torrent of corruption. But perseverance at length gained the victory: agreeably to the prophecy, the city was rebuilt with perpetual enlargement and with decisive firmness.

III. AND, AFTER THE WEEKS SEVEN AND THE WEEKS SIXTY AND TWO, THE ANOINTED ONE SHALL CUT OFF BY DIVORCE, SO THAT they shall be NO MORE HIS, BOTH THE CITY AND THE SANCTUARY.

We had before been told, that from the going forth of an edict to rebuild Jerusalem unto the Anointed One the Prince there should be the same space of time as that which is here again mentioned, namely *sixty nine weeks:* and we have seen, that these *sixty nine weeks*, reckoned from the enacting of

of the decree in the seventh year of Artaxerxes bring us exactly to the year in which the preaching of the Gospel commenced. We are here further told, that, after the expiration of this same period, Messiah will divorce that Church, which, in the language of the ancient prophets, had always been figuratively represented as his mystical consort. The commencement therefore of his cutting her off by a bill of divorce must plainly be considered as synchronizing with the commencement of the ministry of the Gospel. And, accordingly, these two circumstances synchronize exactly together. The Messiah came unto his own; but, from the very first, his own received him not. The Gospel began to be preached by John; but it was never received *nationally* by the Jews. From its earliest promulgation *the Levitical Church*, as *a body*, rejected it. As it was predicted by Isaiah, that the Messiah should be despised and rejected of men; so, when he came unto his own peculiar people, they hid as it were their faces from him; they esteemed him a very wretch, judicially smitten of God*; the light shone in darkness, and the darkness comprehended it not. When the Levitical Church therefore rejected Christ the true bridegroom, he of necessity

* Or, as the expression is interpreted in the Talmud, *stricken with the leprosy*. They viewed him with as much abhorrence as *a leper*.

rejected

rejected her from being his bride. Yet the bill of divorce, prepared and written as it now was, still was not formally given into her hand *, until the Jews had filled up the measure of their iniquities by crucifying the Lord of life. Though no longer in *spiritual* communion with God during *the last week* of *the seventy*, yet the Levitical Church was *forensically* esteemed the holy city, until she had completed the apostasy by which she was finally separated from her heavenly bridegroom. The first step taken towards the divorce was at the end of *the sixty nine weeks:* the finishing hand was put to it at the end of *the seventy weeks.* At the close of the former period, the process (to speak in law terms) commenced, and the bill of divorce was sued out: at the close of the latter period, the proceedings were completed, and the sentence of separation was finally pronounced. Yet, as among the Jews while the business of procuring a divorce was carrying on opportunities were studiously offered to the parties to effect a reconciliation with each other, and as the time of pronouncing the sentence was purposely protracted that nothing might be done hastily and without due deliberation †; so were the proceedings of Messiah against the Le-

* Deut. xxiv. 1.

† See Calmet's Dictionary. Vox *Divorce.*

vitical

vitical Church not urged forward with the impatient rapidity of inflexible severity, but carried on with merciful deliberation through the whole space of his ministry, that abundant time might be allowed for repentance and reconciliation. So accurate is the allegory in all its parts.

That the divorce of the Levitical church commenced with his ministerial coming, our Lord himself teaches us by the mouth of his prophet Isaiah: and he afterwards foretells his passion, which, according to Daniel, takes place at the close of *the seventy weeks.* " Thus saith Jehovah, Where is " the bill of your mother's divorcement by which I " dismissed her? Or who is he among my cre- " ditors to whom I have sold you? Behold, for " your iniquities are ye sold, and for your aposta- " sies is your mother dismissed. *Wherefore came* " *I, and there was no man? Called I, and none* " *answered?* Is then my hand so greatly short- " ened, that I cannot redeem? And have I no " power to deliver?—The Lord Jehovah hath given " me the tongue of the learned, that I might know " how to speak a seasonable word to the weary. " He wakeneth, morning by morning, he wakeneth " mine ear, to hearken with the attention of a " learner. The Lord Jehovah hath opened mine " ear, and I was not rebellious; neither did I with- " draw myself backward. I gave my back to the " smiters,

" smiters, and my cheeks to them that plucked off " the hair: my face I hid not from shame and spit- " ting. For the Lord Jehovah is my helper; there- " fore I am not ashamed. Therefore have I set " my face as a flint; and I know that I shall not " be confounded *." Messiah is here exhibited in his true character of *Jehovah the Son*, the husband of the Levitical Church; but he is exhibited as being constrained to divorce her, *because she received him not at his coming*. The speaker throughout the whole passage is evidently the same; for there is no change of person, no intimation that any one else is introduced. At the beginning of it this speaker is declared to be Jehovah the husband of the Levitical Church. Yet he afterwards acknowledges that he receives his commission from the Lord Jehovah, and minutely foretells the bitter insults which he should experience at the time of his passion. Here then we have a plain proof of the divinity of the Messiah; a position indeed, which necessarily follows from both Christ and Jehovah being represented as the husband of the Church.

But, though the Levitical Church be divorced for a season, she is not always to be thus rejected. The same prophet, after describing with wonderful accuracy those sufferings of the Messiah by which

* Isaiah l. 1, 2, 4—7.

the

the divorce was consummated, impatiently (as it were) calls our attention to the rescinding of it and to the reespousals of the repudiated consort. " He " is despised and rejected of men; a man of sor- " rows and acquainted with grief; and we hid as " it were our faces from him: he was despised, " and we esteemed him not—But he was wounded " for our apostasies, he was bruised for our iniqui- " ties: the chastisement of our peace was upon " him; and with his stripes we are healed—It " pleased the Lord to crush him with affliction. If " his soul shall make a propitiatory sacrifice, he " shall see a seed which shall prolong their days— " By the knowledge of him shall my righteous ser- " vant justify many; for he shall bear the punish- " ment of their iniquities. Therefore will I distri- " bute the many to him for his portion, and the " mighty people shall he share for his spoil: be- " cause he hath poured out his soul unto death: " and he was numbered with the apostates, and he " bare the sin of many, and made intercession for " the apostates. Shout for joy, O thou barren that " didst not bear; break forth into joyful shouting, " and exult, thou that didst not travail: for more " are the children of the desolate than of the mar- " ried wife, saith the Lord. Enlarge the place of " thy tent, and let the canopy of thy habitation be " extended: spare not; lengthen thy cords, and

" firmly

" firmly fix thy stakes. For, on the right hand
" and on the left, thou shalt burst forth with in-
" crease; and thy seed shall inherit the nations,
" and they shall inhabit the desolate cities. Fear
" not, for thou shalt not be confounded, and blush
" not, for thou shalt not be brought to reproach:
" for thou shalt forget the shame of thy youth;
" and the reproach of thy widowhood thou shalt
" remember no more. For thy husband is thy
" Maker; Jehovah God of hosts is his name: and
" thy Redeemer is the Holy One of Israel; the
" God of the whole earth shall he be called. For,
" as a woman forsaken and deeply afflicted, hath
" the Lord recalled thee; and, as a wife wedded in
" youth but afterwards rejected, saith thy God.
" In a little anger have I forsaken thee; but with
" great mercies will I receive thee again: in a short
" wrath I hid my face for a moment from thee;
" but with everlasting kindness will I have mercy
" on thee, saith thy Redeemer Jehovah *."

It is obvious, that this interpretation of the passage necessarily requires us to understand *the holy city that was to be rebuilt* in a figurative sense: for *the holy city* and *the sanctuary*, which the Messiah cut off from him by divorce, are plainly not *the literal town* and *temple of Jerusalem*, but *the Levitical*

* Isaiah liii. 3, 5, 10, 11, 12. liv. 1—8.

Church

Church and *polity*. And, that this interpretation must be the right one, follows from the circumstance of its being the only one that can be made to accord with the chronology of the prophecy. The verb יכרת cannot be translated passively, and applied to *the cutting off of the Messiah by a violent death;* because the crucifixion did not take place at the end of *the sixty nine weeks*, but at the end of *the seventy weeks:* and even those expositors, who would persuade us (contrary to the obvious meaning of the words) that *unto the Messiah* means *unto his death*, are still unable, even after they have adopted an untenable mode of calculation, to shew that the Messiah was cut off *precisely* at the end of *the sixty nine weeks;* which (according to *that* translation of יכרת) the terms of the prophecy require. Neither can the verb יכרת be translated actively *shall cut off* in the sense of *utter excision:* because, although our Lord did at length thus cut off the literal city and sanctuary by the instrumentality of the Romans, he certainly did not so cut them off at the end of *the sixty nine weeks*, but several years subsequent to the expiration even of *the seventy weeks*. But, if neither of these interpretations be tenable, it will be difficult to find a third except that which is here proposed; more especially a third, which, like this, exactly corresponds with the chronology of the prophecy. And, if this interpretation

be

be the true one, of which I have little doubt; it will necessarily follow, as I have just observed, that *the holy city* must be *a figurative holy city*, as we are compelled to conclude from the tenor of that decree to which we are brought by computing backward 490 years from the last of the particulars destined to be accomplished within *the seventy weeks.*

IV. For THE PEOPLE OF THE PRINCE THAT SHALL COME SHALL ACT CORRUPTLY: BUT THE END THEREOF SHALL BE WITH A FLOOD; AND UNTO THE END OF A WAR FIRMLY DECIDED UPON shall be DESOLATIONS.

1. Since the preceding part of the prophecy foretold the rebuilding of the figurative city and assigned the commencement of its reëstablishment as the date of *the seventy weeks;* and since it afterwards foretells, that, notwithstanding its being thus rebuilt, Messiah should cut it off from him by divorce at the end of *the sixty nine weeks:* it may naturally be expected, that *a reason* should be assigned for its being thus signally rejected of God and thus formally repudiated by its divine bridegroom. Accordingly, the prophecy goes on to inform us, that the people of the Prince that should come *should act corruptly.* At the time when our Lord made his appearance, the scribes and Pharisees had reduced the Law to a mere system of decent formality. Its precepts were deprived of their spirituality;

tuality: and these blind leaders of the blind contrived by their vain traditions to authorize even the direct transgression of God's commandments *. Painfully laborious in their observance of each minute ceremonial ordinance, they utterly neglected what was *indeed* of importance. While they were punctiliously curious respecting meats and drinks and washings, they totally forgot that the only real pollution is of a spiritual nature. Intent on adjusting the exact proportion of tithe of mint and anise and cummin, they omitted the weightier matters of the Law, judgment and mercy and faith. Scrupulous in cleansing the outside of the cup and the platter, within they were full of extortion and excess. Insomuch that our Lord pronounced the prophecy of Isaiah to have been exactly accomplished in them: "This people draweth nigh unto "me with their mouth, and honoureth me with their "lips, but their heart is far from me; but in vain "do they worship me, teaching for doctrines the "commandments of men †." Nay even stronger language than this was used both by himself and by his precursor John. "O generation of vipers," exclaimed his indignant harbinger, fully assured that at that very moment the sentence of divorce was gone forth against the Levitical Church and that she

* See Matt. xv. 3—6. † Matt. xv. 7, 8, 9.

was

was on the point of being cut off from the Messiah, fully assured that from that time another consort was espoused who should bring forth unto her Lord a new generation of spiritual children: " O genera-
" tion of vipers, who hath warned you to flee from
" the wrath to come? Bring forth therefore fruits
" meet for repentance: and think not to say within
" yourselves, We have Abraham for our father:
" for I say unto you, that God is able of these
" stones to raise up children unto Abraham. And
" now also the ax is laid to the root of the trees:
" therefore every tree which bringeth not forth good
" fruit is hewn down and cast into the fire. I in-
" deed baptize you with water unto repentance: but
" he that cometh after me is mightier than I, whose
" shoes I am not worthy to bear; he shall baptize
" you with the Holy Ghost and with fire; whose
" fan is in his hand, and he shall thoroughly
" purge his floor, and gather his wheat into
" the garner; but he will burn up the chaff
" with unquenchable fire*." The awful admonition of the Baptist however was disregarded: and the people of the Prince that should come went on *corrupting themselves*, until at length, as it was predicted of them, they *completed their apostasy*. Hence our Lord himself addresses them, shortly be-

* Matt. iii. 7—12.

fore

fore his crucifixion, in the same strong terms of reprehension, that his precursor had adopted. "Wo "unto you, Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for "ye are like unto whited sepulchres, which indeed "appear beautiful outward, but are within full of "dead men's bones and of all uncleanness. Even "so ye also outwardly appear righteous unto men, "but within ye are full of hypocrisy and iniquity. "Wo unto you, Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! "because ye build the tombs of the prophets, and "garnish the sepulchres of the righteous, and say, "If we had been in the days of our fathers, we "would not have been partakers with them in the "blood of the prophets. Wherefore ye be witnesses "unto yourselves, that ye are the children of them "which killed the prophets. Fill ye up then the "measure of your fathers. Ye serpents, ye generation of vipers, how can ye escape the damnation "of hell? Wherefore behold I send unto you prophets, and wise-men, and scribes: and some of "them ye shall kill and crucify; and some of "them shall ye scourge in your synagogues, and "persecute them from city to city: that upon you "may come all the righteous blood shed upon the "earth, from the blood of righteous Abel unto the "blood of Zacharias son of Barachias, whom ye "slew between the temple and the altar. Verily "I say unto you, All these things shall come upon

"this

" this generation. O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou " that killest the prophets, and stonest them which " are sent unto thee, how often would I have ga- " thered thy children together even as a hen ga- " thereth her chickens under her wings, and ye " would not! Behold, your house is left unto you " desolate. For I say unto you, Ye shall not see " me henceforth, till ye shall say, Blessed is he that " cometh in the name of the Lord *." Such were the Jews during the ministry of Christ; and, what they were at the time of the destruction of their city and temple by Titus, let their own historian Josephus declare. " Every human law was trodden " under foot by them; all divine institutions were " ridiculed; and they scoffed at the oracles of their " ancient prophets, as the idle reveries of fanati- " cism †.—I believe, that, if the Romans had delay- " ed to execute judgment on those wretches, their " city would either have been swallowed up by an " earthquake, or swept away by a flood, or de- " stroyed like Sodom by lightning; for it produced " a race far more impious than those who suffered " such calamities ‡."

* Matt. xxiii. 27—39.

† Joseph de bell. Jud. lib. iv. cap. 6. § 3. p. 1188. edit. Hudson.

‡ Ibid. lib. v. cap. 13. §. 6. p. 1256.

2. As

2. As *the mention of the divorce* naturally led the prophet to account for it by specifying *the extreme corruption* of the people; so, from specifying their *extreme corruption*, he is hastily carried on to foretell *the punishment* of it. The end of this corrupt race is to be with *a flood*. In the language of prophecy, *a flood*, as it is well known, is continually used to describe *a hostile invasion*. Such accordingly was the end of the Jewish nation. The Roman armies, like a mighty inundation, swept it away; and its members have ever since been scattered over the face of the whole earth.

3. Daniel adds, that *unto the end of the war should be desolations*. He here expresses literally what he had before described figuratively. This tremendously desolating war is that which was occasioned by the progress of the allegorical inundation; and perhaps there never yet was a war of equal duration that was equally destructive.

(1.) The siege of Jerusalem commencing at the celebration of the Passover, an immense multitude of people, which at another time would have been spread abroad through the country, were cooped up in the city as in a prison: whence, as might naturally be expected, they soon experienced all the horrors both of famine and pestilence. The miseries, which the besieged endured, are described with much ela-

borateness of detail by Josephus*: and, among other particulars, sufficient to freeze the blood with horror, he relates the well-known story of the noble woman who killed her own child for the sake of food†. In short, they were reduced to such extremities, that they eagerly devoured what the most filthy animals would have refused‡. Nor was this the whole of their distress. While their enemies assaulted them from without, civil discord raged within. Of so peculiarly savage a nature was the devastating fury of the Zealots, that the Jewish historian compares their faction to a wild beast, which, for want of other food, preys upon its own vitals§. "There was an ancient oracle among them," says he, "which foretold, that the city would be taken, "and the holy places burnt according to the laws of "war, when a sedition should break out, and when "the hands of the native citizens should pollute the "temple of God." And he adds, that "the Zea-"lots, believing it, readily lent themselves to be the "ministers of its accomplishment||."

Such were the miseries, that befell Jerusalem *during* its siege and *previous* to the time when it was

* Joseph. de bell. Jud. lib. v. cap. 12. § 3. p. 1252.
† Ibid. lib. vi. cap. 3. § 4. p. 1274.
‡ Ibid. lib. vi. cap. 3. § 3. p. 1274.
§ Ibid. lib. v. cap. 1. § 1. p. 1211.
|| Ibid. lib. iv. cap. 6. § 3. p. 1188.

taken

taken and sacked by the Romans: but the *most complete* idea of its desolation is conveyed to the mind by the historian's account of the destruction of the temple, which may well be considered as the consummation of its calamities. " While the sacred " edifice was burning, every thing was plundered " by the soldiers, and all who were taken were " slaughtered without mercy. Neither age, nor " rank, was spared: but boys and old men, the " laity and the priesthood, were equally slain. All " suffered alike, whether they asked for quarter, or " defended themselves. The crackling of the flames " was heard in horrid concert with the groans of the " dying: and, from the loftiness of the hill and the " bulk of the edifice that was burning, it might have " been thought that the whole city was on fire. No- " thing can be conceived either louder or more " dreadful than the clamour. The war-cry of the " Roman legions rushing forward to the work of " death mingled with the yell of the insurgents " hemmed in by fire and sword. The people, that " were left above, threw themselves in all the mad- " ness of despair upon their enemies, uttering hor- " rible shrieks on account of the greatness of their " sufferings. Those in the city joined their out- " cries to those upon the hill. Many, who were " half dead with famine, when they saw the confla- " gration of the temple, burst forth again into fran-

" tic howlings and lamentations. Perèa and the
" surrounding mountains reëchoed to their cries,
" and the loud reverberation increased the noise of
" the combatants. Yet the slaughter was more
" dreadful than even the noise. The hill, on which
" the temple stood, appeared to be one blaze of
" fire from its very roots. Nevertheless, the tor-
" rents of blood were still more copious; and the
" multitude of the slaughtered exceeded that of the
" slaughterers. No where could the ground be
" seen on account of the dead bodies which covered
" it. The soldiers, trampling upon heaps of car-
" cases, pursued those that fled from their fury,—
" until they came to a portico of the outer temple
" that was yet standing. To this women and chil-
" dren and a mixed multitude had fled to the num-
" ber of about six thousand. Before Cesar had
" determined any thing concerning them and be-
" fore the generals had given any orders, the sol-
" diers hurried on by rage set the portico on fire.
" Whence it happened, that some perished in the
" flames, and others by throwing themselves down
" headlong to escape them; insomuch that not a
" single soul was saved*."

Well then might Josephus observe, that " the
" miseries of no nation upon record, even from the

* Joseph. de bell. Jud. lib. vi. cap. 5. § 1, 2. p. 1280, 1281.

" most

" most remote antiquity, were in any degree compa-
" rable with those of the Jews*." Well might he declare, as if in confirmation of the prophecies both of Daniel and of that Messiah whom his countrymen rejected, " I am persuaded, that there never
" existed so wicked a race of men, or a city that
" underwent such sufferings: they themselves
" pulled down destruction upon their own heads †."

(2.) These dreadful calamities however were by no means confined to Jerusalem alone: as it had been predicted, from the very beginning to the very end of the war there were desolations throughout all the territory of Judèa. " The victories of the
" Romans were not confined to this or that place,
" but like a flood overran the whole land ‡. Jose-
" phus says, that there was no part of Judèa, which
" did not partake of the calamities of the capital
" city. At Antioch the Jews being falsely accused
" of a design to burn the city, many of them were
" burnt in the theatre, and others were slain. The
" Romans pursued, and took, and slew, them every
" where: as particularly at the siege of Macherus;
" at the wood Jardes, when the Jews were sur-
" rounded, and none of them escaped, but being
" not fewer than three thousand were all slain; and

* Joseph. de bell. Jud. in Proëm. § 4. p. 955.

† Ibid. lib. v. cap. 10. § 5. p. 1246.

‡ " Their end shall be with a flood."

" at

" at Masada, where, being closely besieged and
" upon the point of being taken, they first murdered
" their wives and children and then themselves to
" the number of nine hundred and sixty, to prevent
" their falling into the enemies hands. When
" Judèa was totally subdued, the danger extended
" to those who dwelt at a distance. Many were
" slain in Egypt, and their temple there was shut
" up: and, in Cyrenè, the followers of Jonathan, a
" weaver, and author of new disturbances, were
" most of them slain. He himself was taken pri-
" soner; and by his false accusation three thousand
" of the richest Jews were condemned and put to
" death. With this account Josephus concludes
" his history of the Jewish war *."

What has been said might alone be sufficient to shew the accuracy of Daniel's prediction, that *unto the end of the war should be desolations:* but Bp. Newton has given us from Josephus *a summary* of these desolations, which so remarkably verifies the prophecy, that it is peculiarly apposite to my present purpose. " Of those, who perished during the
" whole siege of Jerusalem, there were 1,100,000.
" Many also were slain at other times, and in other
" places. By the command of Florus, who was
" the first author of the war, there were slain at Je-

* Bp. Newton's Dissert. xix.

" rusalem

" rusalem 3600; by the inhabitants of Cesarèa, " above 20,000; at Scythopolis, above 13,000; at " Ascalon 2500, and at Ptolemais 2000; at Alex- " andria, under Tiberius Alexander the president, " 50,000; at Joppa, when it was taken by Cestius " Gallus, 8400; in a mountain called *Asamon* near " Sepphoris, above 2000; at Damascus, 10,000; " in a battle with the Romans at Ascalon, 10,000; " in an ambuscade near the same place, 8000; at " Japha, 15,000; of the Samaritans upon mount " Garizin, 11,600; at Jotapa, 40,000; at Joppa " when taken by Vespasian, 4200; at Tarichea " 6500, and after the city was taken 1200; at " Gamala, 4000 slain, besides 5000 who threw " themselves down a precipice; of those who fled " with John from Gischala, 6000; of the Gada- " renes, 15,000 slain, besides an infinite number " drowned; in the villages of Idumèa, above " 10,000 slain; at Gerasa, 1000; at Macheras, " 1700; in the wood of Jardes, 3000; in the cas- " tle of Masada, 960; in Cyrenè by Catullus the " governor, 3000. Besides these, many of every " age, sex, and condition, were slain in this war, " who are not reckoned: but, of these who are " reckoned, the number amounts to above " 1,357,660; which would appear almost incredi- " ble, if their own historian had not so particularly " enumerated them *."

* Bp. Newton's Dissert. xx.

4. I have

4. I have hitherto left unnoticed the epithet which Daniel applies to this desolating war, though it is highly deserving of our attention: he styles it *a war firmly decided upon* or *absolutely and irrevocably predetermined.* The phraseology here adopted alludes, if I mistake not, to the prophecies which were so awfully accomplished in the course of the Jewish war, particularly those of Moses and our Lord. The prediction of Moses is so wonderfully minute in its detail of circumstances, that it resembles a history of past events rather than a prophecy of what was then future *. The prediction of our Lord refers to former prophecies; and declares, that the impending calamities of the Jewish nation were so *irrevocably predetermined* (to use the language of Daniel), that the universe itself might sooner be dissolved than they should fail of taking place. "When ye "shall see Jerusalem compassed with armies," says he, "then know that the desolation thereof is nigh. "Then let them which are in Judèa flee to the "mountains; and let them which are in the midst "of it depart out; and let not them that are in the "countries enter thereinto. *For these be the days* "*of vengeance, that all things which are written* "*may be fulfilled.* But woe unto them that are

* Deut. xxviii. xxix. See Bp. Newton's Dissertation on this prophecy.

"with

" with child, and to them that give suck in those " days, for there shall be great distress in the land, " and wrath upon this people. And they shall " fall by the edge of the sword, and shall be led " captive into all nations—And, when these things " begin to come to pass, then look up, and lift up " your heads, for your redemption draweth nigh— " Behold the fig-tree, and all the trees: when they " now shoot forth, ye see and know of your own- " selves, that summer is now nigh at hand. So " likewise, when ye see these things come to pass, " know ye that the kingdom of God is nigh at hand. " *Verily I say unto you, This generation shall not* " *pass away till all* (these) *things shall be. Heaven* " *and earth shall pass away; but my words shall not* " *pass away**." Thus it appears, that this war, being the appointed punishment for the heinous sin of the Jews in killing the Messiah, was, in an especial manner, *firmly decided upon*, or *irrevocably predetermined*, in the divine counsels. Heaven and earth might have sooner passed away, than the words of Christ. The days of vengeance were absolutely *doomed* to come, in order that all things which had been written might be fulfilled †.

It

* Luke xxi. 20—24, 28—33. Comp. Matt. xxiv. 34.

† " Let the Jews," says Abp. Tillotson, " give us any pro- " bable account, for what great sin it was that God first gave " them

It is a remarkable circumstance, that Josephus the Jew, and Titus the Roman, alike bear their testimony to the propriety of the epithet which Daniel bestows upon this war. Josephus was so struck with the tremendous calamities which befell his countrymen, that he sometimes ascribes them to the fatal influence of some irreversible decree, and at other times to the particular overruling Providence of God. "They were blinded," says he, "*by that* "*fate*, which was impending over their city and "themselves *—The vast multitude (in Jerusalem) "was collected together from without; for the "whole nation was *by fate* shut up as in a "prison, the war having beleaguered the city "when it was crouded with men: wherefore the "multitude of the slain exceeded any calamity whe- "ther inflicted by human or divine agency †—

"them up to that great judgment of an industrious endeavour "to destroy one another. If they cannot, let them believe the "account which the history of the New Testament gives of it; "and the truth whereof was so well confirmed by the fulfilling "our Saviour's predictions against them. The Apostle gives a "clear account of their sin in 1 Thess. ii. 15, 16. *That it was* "*because they had killed the Lord Jesus and their own prophets,* "*and persecuted the Apostles.*" Sermons. Vol. xii. p. 35.

* Πεπηρωνλο γαρ ὑπο τυ χρεων, ὁ φητε πολει και αυλοις ηδη παρην. Joseph. de bell. Jud. lib. v. cap. xiii. § 7. p. 1256.

† Ibid. lib. vi. cap. 9. § 4. p. 1291. His expression in this passage is ὑπο της ειμαρμενης.

"Hence

" Hence we may learn both the power *of God* over " the wicked, and *the fortune* of the Romans *." So again, addressing himself to John and his countrymen, he exclaims, " I am exhorting you *in oppo-* " *sition to fate*, I am forcibly attempting to save " those who are *condemned by God.* Who is igno- " rant of the writings of our ancient prophets? Who " knows not, that *an oracle is now impending over* " *this wretched city? God* truly, *God himself*, " brings by the agency of the Romans expiatory " fire to consume your temple, and is on the point " of subverting your city full of so many abomina- " tions †." In a similar manner he elsewhere declares, that " *it was God*, who had condemned the " whole people, and who was turning to their de- " struction every attempt to save them ‡." As for Titus, pagan as he was, when he viewed the immense strength of the fortifications after the city was taken, he could not refrain from exclaiming " We have fought *with God on our side;* and *it is* " *God*, who hath dragged the Jews out of these " strong holds; for what could either the hands of " men or warlike machines do against those " towers?" And, as if a *single* exclamation were in-

* Joseph. de bell. Jud. lib. vi. cap. 8. § 4. p. 1289.

† Ibid. lib. vi. cap. 2. § 1. p. 1267.

‡ Ibid. lib. v. cap. 13. § 5. p. 1255.

sufficient

sufficient to describe the impression made upon his mind, he continued, as we are informed by the historian, to *converse repeatedly* with his friends on the same subject *.

V. YET HE SHALL MAKE FIRM A COVENANT WITH MANY FOR ONE WEEK.

Daniel had brought us to the end of *the sixty nine weeks*, when the mention of Messiah's divorcing the city and sanctuary at that time naturally led him to account for the circumstance, on the score of *the extreme corruption and wickedness of the people;* and the specification of their corruption no less naturally carried him on to predict *their punishment.* As yet however he has left unnoticed *the last week* of *the seventy.* He now therefore, for the purpose of shewing us how *the seventieth week* would be employed, returns to the end of *the sixty nine weeks,* from which the mention of the divorce had led him to make an anticipatory digression. We might indeed already have concluded, that this week would be devoted to the ministry of the Gospel: for, since *the sixty nine weeks* bring us *unto the Messiah* by which expression (as it has been shewn) we must understand *unto the commencement of the Gospel ministry,* and since the events with which *the seventy weeks* expire synchronize with the crucifixion;

* Joseph. de bell. Jud. lil. vi. cap. 9. § 1. p. 1290.

fixion; *the last week* must necessarily be the period of our Lord's ministration, either in his own person, or in that of his precursor John the Baptist. But we are now specially informed, that such is the case. Though the Messiah should, at the end of *the sixty nine weeks*, begin to cut off from him by divorce both the city and the sanctuary; yet should he nevertheless make firm a covenant, even the Christian covenant of grace, with many for *one week*.

The making of this new covenant was the consequence of disannulling the former covenant with the Levitical Church. Hence there is a peculiar propriety in mentioning it at the very time, when the prophet was so awfully proving, by the judgments which should befall the Jewish nation, that their covenant with God existed no longer. Thrice in the year, at the three great festivals of the Passover, the Feast of weeks or Pentecost, and the Feast of the tabernacles or in-gathering, all the males were required by the Law to appear before God at Jerusalem. Such a concourse to the capital would necessarily leave the frontiers and every fortified place wholly unguarded: under any form of government therefore, except a theocracy, this injunction would have been the very height of impolitic madness. But their divine king bound himself by covenant to guard

guard them upon these occasions, by taking away from their neighbours even the very desire of invading them. "The feast of unleavened bread "shalt thou keep: seven days thou shalt eat unleavened bread, as I commanded thee, in the time "of the month Abib; for in the month Abib thou "camest out from Egypt—In earing time and in "harvest thou shalt rest. And thou shalt observe "the feast of weeks of the first fruits of wheat-harvest, and the feast of ingathering at the year's end. "Thrice in the year shall all your males appear "before the Lord God, the God of Israel. For I "will cast out the nations before thee, and enlarge "thy borders: *neither shall any man desire thy "land, when thou shalt go up to appear before the "Lord thy God, thrice in the year* *." Now it is a remarkable circumstance, that the siege of Jerusalem commenced at the time of one of their great festivals, that of the Passover, when the whole multitude of the people were gathered together into the city to celebrate it. Hitherto God, agreeably to his covenant, had protected them; but now, as if to shew the complete disannulling of the covenant, he brought their enemies upon them at the very time when they esteemed themselves peculiarly under

* Exod. xxxiv. 18, 21—24. See also Deuter. xvi.

the divine protection. Whatever might befall them at *other* times, in the days of each of their great festivals they considered themselves as perfectly secure, because God had covenanted that they should be so *. When one of these very festivals therefore was selected as the era of the commencement of their destruction, they were by that circumstance completely ensnared to their ruin: they were, as Josephus remarkably expresses it, "cooped up in their city, as in a prison, by the in-"vincible decree of fate."

Besides this unequivocal demonstration that the covenant with the Levitical Church was disannulled, it is worthy of notice that more than one circumstance occurred both during the siege and previous to it which seem to have been ordained to intimate that such was now the case. "About four "years before the war broke out," says Josephus, "while the city was yet enjoying peace and plenty, "one Jesus the son of Ananus, a rustic of low rank,

* This persuasion appears very strongly in the speech which John addressed to Josephus, when the latter had been persuading the infatuated Jews to spare their country. "They had "no reason," he observed, "to fear destruction, inasmuch "as Jerusalem was the city of God." Joseph de bell. Jud. lib. vi. cap. 2. § 1. p. 1267.

"coming

" coming to the festival in which it was the custom
" for all to pitch tabernacles near the temple in ho-
" nour of God, suddenly began to exclaim, *A*
" *voice from the east, a voice from the west, a voice*
" *from the four winds, a voice against Jerusalem*
" *and the temple, a voice against bride-grooms and*
" *brides, a voice against the whole people.* Such
" was his cry, night and day, through all the streets
" of the city. Some however of the leading men,
" indignant at this ill-omened language, appre-
" hended him and punished him with many stripes.
" But he, neither saying any thing in his own behalf,
" nor privately supplicating those who scourged
" him, continued to utter the same exclamations
" that he had done before. Wherefore the magis-
" trates, think, as was truly the case, that the man
" must be under the influence of some divine im-
" pulse, brought him before the Roman governor;
" where, although scourged to the very bones, he
" neither made any supplication, nor shed a single
" tear; but, as much as his strength permitted him,
" he still at every stroke cried out in a lamentable
" voice, *Woe, woe, to Jerusalem.* But, when Albi-
" nus (for he was at that time the governor) asked
" him, who he was, and whence he came, and why
" he uttered such exclamations; to all these ques-
" tions he gave no answer, ceasing not to denounce
" the same miseries against the city, until Albinus

" was constrained to discharge him on the supposi-
" tion of madness. Henceforth, until the time of
" the war, he neither visited any of the citizens, nor
" was known to utter a word except his daily im-
" precation of *Woe, woe, to Jerusalem.* He neither
" cursed those who were wont to beat him every
" day, nor did he testify any thankfulness to those
" who gave him food; but he had one answer of
" direful import prepared alike for all. He was
" the most vociferous at the festivals: and, though
" he went on in this mannner seven years and five
" months, he neither became hoarse, nor appeared
" to suffer any fatigue, until at length, having be-
" held the verification of his presages in the invest-
" ment of the city, he ceased. For, circuiting the
" walls, he cried out with a loud voice, *Woe, woe,*
" *to the city, and to the temple, and to the people:*
" and, when at length he added, *Woe likewise to my-*
" *self*, a stone, that was projected from one of the
" machines, struck him, and immediately killed him;
" insomuch that he died, while in the very act of
" uttering his wonted ominous exclamations *."
The same historian mentions another yet more ter-
rific circumstance, which he asserts to have taken
place not long before the destruction of Jerusalem.
" At the feast of Pentecost," says he, " as the priests

* Joseph. de bell. Jud. lib. vi. cap. 5. § 3. p. 1282.

" were going in the night to officiate in the inner " temple according to custom, they heard at first a " kind of confused murmur, and after that a loud " and distinct voice as of a multitude exclaiming, " *Let us depart hence**." Much the same account is given by the Roman historian Tacitus. " The " temple," says he, " was illuminated with a fire " from the clouds: its doors suddenly flew open: " and a voice greater than human was heard, *The* " *gods are departing*. At the same time a tremen- " dous noise was heard while they were issuing " forth †." From these various circumstances it was not unnatural for the Jews themselves to suspect that the God of their fathers had forsaken them, and to forebode their approaching fate. Josephus has preserved his own remarkable oration to his countrymen, previous to the completion of the dreadful calamities that befell them. " You have not " *omitted* to indulge in secret sins, such as thefts, " stratagems, and adulteries; but you are *emulous* in " the commission of rapine and murder, and *glory* in " the invention of new modes of wickedness. The " temple is become the receptacle of all abomina- " tions; and the sacred place, which the very Ro- " mans revere at an awful distance, is polluted by

* Joseph. de bell. Jud. lib. vi. cap. 5. § 3. p. 1282.

† Tacit. Hist. l. v. c. 13.

" the hands of native citizens—When the Babylo-
" nian of old waged war against your ancestors, and
" took and burned both the city and the temple, I
" do not believe that their impieties were in any de-
" gree equal to yours: so that I think, that God
" hath withdrawn himself from his holy places, and
" hath ranged himself on the side of your enemies.
" Even a good man shuns the house of the wicked,
" and hates those who dwell in it: can you then per-
" suade God to dwell in the midst of your iniqui-
" ties; God, whose eyes behold every thing that is
" hidden, and whose ears listen to things transacted
" with the most impenetrable secrecy and in the
" deepest silence *?"

The remark was just. While the Messiah was divorcing the Levitical Church, he was making firm with many a new and better covenant. While he was rejecting his ancient people on account of their obstinate rejection of him, he was building up a new holy city to occupy the place of the former one. The truth of this the Jews themselves were compelled unwarily to confess. " There was a certain
" householder, which planted a vineyard, and
" hedged it about, and digged a wine-press in it,
" and built a tower, and let it out to husbandmen,
" and went into a far country. And, when the

* Joseph. de bell. Jud. lib. v. cap. 9. § 4. p. 1243, 1244.

" time of the fruit drew near, he sent his servants
" to the husbandmen that they might receive the
" fruit of it. And the husbandmen took his ser-
" vants, and beat one, and killed another, and
" stoned another. Again he sent other servants
" more than the first; and they did unto them like-
" wise. But last of all he sent unto them his son,
" saying, They will reverence my son. But, when
" the husbandmen saw the son, they said among
" themselves, This is the heir; come, let us kill
" him, and let us seize on his inheritance. And they
" caught him, and cast him out of the vineyard, and
" slew him. When the Lord therefore of the vine-
" yard cometh, what will he do unto those hus-
" bandmen? They say unto him, He will misera-
" bly destroy those wicked men, and will let out
" his vineyard unto other husbandmen, which shall
" render him the fruits in their seasons. Jesus
" saith unto them, Did ye never read in the Scrip-
" tures, The stone which the builders rejected, the
" same is become the head of the corner: this is the
" Lord's doing, and it is marvellous in our eyes?
" Therefore I say unto you, the kingdom of God
" shall be taken from you, and given to a nation
" bringing forth the fruits thereof. And, whoso-
" ever shall fall on this stone, shall be broken: but,
" on whomsoever it shall fall, it will grind him to
" powder *."

* Matt. xxi 33—44. See also Rom. x. xi.

VI. And

VI. AND IN HALF A WEEK HE SHALL CAUSE THE SACRIFICE AND MEAT-OFFERING TO CEASE (FOR UPON THE BORDER shall be THE ABOMINATION THAT MAKETH DESOLATE), EVEN UNTIL AN UTTER END, AND THAT FIRMLY DECIDED UPON, SHALL BE POURED UPON THE DESOLATOR.

1. The last part of the prophecy now only remains to be explained. We have seen, that *the seventy weeks* expire with the death of Christ; consequently they expire long before the siege of Jerusalem. To this great crisis of the Jewish nation Daniel has already been hurried forward by his subject proleptically. He now, after having taught us what was to take place in *the seventieth week*, returns to it; and specifies more particularly the abolition of the temple service, and the nature of the power by which (as an instrument in the hand of the Messiah) it should be abolished. He teaches us, that the sacrifice and meat-offering should be be caused to cease in *half a week*, and assigns as a cause of it *the appearance of the desolating abomination upon the border*.

(1.) The great error in Dr. Prideaux's scheme is his considering this *half week*, in which the sacrifice and meet-offering were to be abolished, as *the latter half* of *the last week* of *the seventy*: whence, rightly judging that *the seventy weeks* must necessarily be esteemed continuous, he is compelled to separate

the

the abolition of the sacrifice from the appearance of the desolating abomination, and to place it in *the seventieth week*, supposing it to mean *the spiritual abolition of the Levitical sacrifices by the one great sacrifice of Christ*. But, without mentioning minor objections, the very arrangement itself is hampered with difficulties which can never be overcome. The abolition of the sacrifice *must*, according to the only natural exposition of the context, so far synchronize with the appearance of *the desolating abomination* upon the border, as the thing that is effected synchronizes with the thing that instrumentally effects it*. The appearance however of *the desolating abomination* is by our Lord himself fixed to the investment of Jerusalem by the Roman armies: and it was so invested, first by Cestius, who precipitately and unaccountably (on *human* principles of action) withdrew his troops and thus afforded the Christians an opportunity of escaping; and secondly by Titus, who destroyed it. Therefore *the abolition of the sacrifice and meat-offering* must be *the abolition of the literal temple service*, which occurred not many days before Titus stormed and sacked the city. Hence it will follow, since *the seventy weeks* are continuous, and since *the last week* expires with the crucifixion as being *the last week* of *the se-*

* According to the 12th abstract position.

venty,

venty *, that *the half week*, in which the Levitical sacrifices were abolished, cannot possibly be *the latter half* of *the last week* of *the seventy* in the course of which the Messiah makes firm his covenant with many, but must be an altogether *different* and *distinct* period, though similarly consisting of *three years and a half*. Nor indeed are we any way *obliged* to suppose the identity of this *half week* and *the last half* of *the seventieth week*, notwithstanding many commentators *do* suppose it. Judging *a priori*, we either may, or may not, conclude them to be the same. The continuity of *the seventy weeks* is equally preserved in either case. But the manner, in which *the abolition of the sacrifice* is connected with *the appearance of the desolating abomination*, plainly shews, that two *entirely distinct* periods are spoken of, the *one* considerably posterior to and disjoined from the *other*. According to our common English translation indeed, *one and the same* period only can be spoken of in both places, because it renders the original "in the midst of *the* week," thus referring us back to *the seventieth week:* but the original itself may as properly be understood to say "in the midst" or rather "in half of *a* week." Hence Sir Isaac Newton, like myself, renders the passage "in half *a* week:" and, however reprehensi-

* According to the 6th and 2d abstract positions

ble

ble his scheme may be in other points, justly supposes, that this *half week* is not *the half of the previously mentioned week*, but that it is an entirely distinct portion of time. The same opinion is also maintained by Scaliger and Mede, the latter of whom similarly translates the passage "in half *a* week*."

(2.) The express character of this insulated *half week* is, that *it should bring about the abolition of the sacrifice and meat-offering by the instrumentality of the desolating abomination.* Hence, since it is the period destined to *effect* such abolition, it must expire when it has *accomplished* its office. Consequently, it must be *the three years and a half* immediately *preceding* the abolition. And with this character we shall find that those three years and a half precisely accord. Jerusalem was taken in the beginning of September A. D. 70: and, some little time before, on the seventeenth day of the month *Panemus* which (according to Suidas) answers to the

* I conceive, that I have a right to adduce Mr. Mede, because, although he supposes *the half week* to be a half of *the seventieth week*, he does not suppose it to be a half of the last mentioned *one week* during which a covenant was to be confirmed with many. That *one week* he conceives, however erroneously, to be *the last week* of *the sixty two:* yet his interpretation equally serves to prove *my* point, namely that we are no way bound to esteem *the half week* as the half of the preceding *one week*. See Mede's Works. b. iii. p. 706.

July of the Romans, Titus was informed, as we are taught by Josephus, that the daily sacrifice was discontinued for want of persons to attend it*. The subsequent destruction of the temple put an effectual end to it: because, since it was illegal to offer it in any place except that, it never could be renewed unless the temple were previously rebuilt. Now, if we reckon back three years and a half from the autumn of A. D. 70, we shall be brought to the spring of A. D. 67: or (should we wish to make our calculation with more minute precision), if we reckon back three years and a half from the seventeenth day of *Panemus* or *July* A. D. 70, we shall be brought to the seventeenth day of *January* A. D. 67. Accordingly, at this very time the war, which produced the abolition of the daily sacrifice and the destruction of the city, commenced. In the 12th year of Nero A. D. 66, Cestius invested Jerusalem; but, instead of prosecuting the siege, he suddenly raised it. The Christians had to make their escape agreeably to the warning of their Lord, and the fated *half week* had not yet commenced: therefore the attempt proved abortive, and the affairs of the Romans in Judèa seemed to be in a desperate state. Such, to the no small consternation of Nero, was the posture of things at the beginning of the 67th

* Joseph. de bell. Jud. lib. vi. cap. 2. § 1. p. 1266.

year

year of the Christian era. At this time he appointed Vespasian to take the command against the Jews: and the war was renewed (according to Sir Isaac Newton) in the spring of the year, or rather (as we may collect from Josephus) before the expiration of the winter*; that is to say, it was renewed about the middle or latter end of January. Here then commenced *the half week* destined to bring about the abolition of the sacrifice: and precisely at the end of it, the sacrifice, agreeably to the prophecy, was abolished †.

* Vespasian, upon his appointment to the command, sends his son from Achaia to Alexandria for the purpose of bringing thence the fifth and tenth legions; while, he himself, crossing the Hellespont, marches by land into Syria. Upon this Titus, having reached Alexandria *with greater rapidity than was usual in winter* (ωκυτερον η καλα χειμωνος ωραν), conducts the troops, on account of which he was sent, by forced marches, and joins his father *in a very short time* (δια ταχεος) at Ptolemaïs. See Joseph de bell. Jud. lib. iii. cap. 1. § 3. cap. 4. § 2. p. 1118, 1122.

† This part of the prophecy is thus explained by Sir Isaac Newton. "*And in half a week he shall cause the sacrifice and* "*oblation to cease*; that is, by the war of the Romans upon the "Jews: which war, after some commotions, began in the 13th "year of Nero A. D. 67, in the Spring, when Vespasian with "an army invaded them; and ended in the 2d year of Vespa- "sian A. D. 70, in Autumn, Sept. 7, when Titus took the city, "having burned the temple 27 days before: so that it lasted "three years and a half." Observ. on Daniel. c. 10. p. 136.

2. But

2. But it is said, that *the prince that should come*, or *the Messiah*, should cause the sacrifice and meat-offering to cease; and the *manner*, in which he should cause it to cease, is described as being by *the appearance on the border of the abomination that maketh desolate*. The prophecy of our Lord, as delivered by St. Luke, teaches us to understand by this expression *the investment of Jerusalem by the Roman armies* *, a subject on which he elsewhere dwells with much vehemence of affection †: and he himself, in more than one of his parables, plainly informs us, that the Romans were no more than instruments in the hand of a great king to slay the murderers of his servants and to burn their city ‡.

3. Yet, though the Romans might be mere instruments in the hand of the Messiah, they undertook the work of destruction, not from any zeal in the service of God, but to promote their own ambitious views of aggrandisement and conquest. These desolators therefore are in *their* turn destined to experience utter excision. It is well remarked by Sir Isaac Newton, that "Daniel's prophecies reach "to the end of the world, and that there is scarce a "prophecy in the Old Testament concerning Christ, "which doth not in something or other relate to his

* Luke xxi. 20. † Luke xix. 41—44.

‡ See Matt. xxii. 1—7—Mark xii. 9—Luke xx. 16.

"second

" second coming*." Hence, most probably with the design of making this prophecy homogeneous with all the other prophecies of Daniel, Irenèus, Hippolytus, and Apollinarius, interpreted *the half week* as relating to the times of Antichrist, and supposed it to describe the same period as *the three times and a half* making *each day* equivalent to *a time*. However untenable this exposition may be, because plainly irreconcileable with our Lord's fixing *the desolating abomination* to mean *the Roman armies at the siege of Jerusalem*, the idea itself of extending the present prophecy beyond the Jewish war seems to me to be perfectly just.

The extension, of which I speak, will be found in the last clause of the prediction. The meaning of this clause has been greatly obscured, or (to speak more properly) altogether perverted, by translating the word שומם passively *the desolated* and applying it to *the Jews*, instead of translating it actively *the desolator* and applying it to *the Romans*. Twice elsewhere, as I have already observed, Daniel uses this participle, and in both places in an *active* sense: in the same sense I think it sufficiently manifest that he uses it here also. He had previously foretold, that there should be desolations unto the end of the war. It is therefore somewhat tautological, and a

* Observ. on Dan. c. x. p. 132.

sort

sort of repetition, to say afterwards, *an utter end shall be poured upon the desolated.* There is however a much more serious objection than this to the common interpretation. If the word שומם be translated *the desolated*, and if it be understood of *the Jews*, the prophecy has never been fulfilled: and, what is more, consistently with another prophecy, it never *can* be fulfilled. According to the usual passive translation of שומם, the clause runs *until a full end shall be poured upon the desolated*, that is, *upon the desolated Jews:* and this *full end* has been supposed to have been poured out upon them either in the days of Titus at the conclusion of the war of seven years, or at least in the days of Adrian when they were completely broken as a nation. But respecting all such interpretations it may be observed, that a full end has *not* been poured out upon the Jews. They still subsist as a distinct people, though scattered over the face of the whole earth; and thus fulfil the prophecy of Jeremiah, "Fear thou not, O "Jacob my servant, saith the Lord, for I am with "thee: for I will make a full end of all the nations "whither I have driven thee; but *I will not make a* "*full end of thee*, but correct thee in measure; yet "will I not leave thee wholly unpunished *." The word,

* Jerem. xlvi. 28. The same prophet elsewhere strongly testifies, "Thus saith the Lord, which giveth the sun for a light "by

word, here used by Jeremiah to express *a full end*, is exactly the same as that, which Daniel uses to describe *the utter end* that was to be poured out: the substantive כלה is alike employed by both prophets, and evidently in the same sense. If then a full end is to be made of the nations among which the Jews are dispersed, and if a full end is *not* to be made of the Jews themselves: it is plain, that *the full end*, which Daniel speaks of as being poured out, cannot, consistently with the prediction of Jeremiah, be poured out upon the Jews, but must be poured out upon the nations among which they are dispersed. Yet, if שומם be passively translated *the desolated*, none but *the Jews* can be intended. Hence it necessarily follows, that it must be actively translated *the desolator;* and must be understood of that *Roman power*, whose armies had just before been described under the appellation of *a desolating abomination*, and through whose territories the greatest part of the Jews properly so called is scattered.

The clause, when thus rendered, concludes with a word of comfort, and a promise of final reconcilia-

" by day and the ordinances of the moon and the stars for a " light by night, which divideth the sea when the waves there- " of roar; the Lord of hosts is his name: If those ordinances " depart from before me, saith the Lord, then the seed of " Israel shall also cease from being a nation before me for " ever." Jerem. xxxi. 35, 36.

tion,

tion, to the afflicted Levitical Church, the divorced consort of the Messiah. The sacrifice and meat-offering are indeed to be abolished at the close of *half a prophetic week* reckoned from the commencement of a peculiarly devastating war, for the abomination that maketh desolate is to be upon the border. Yet things are so to continue only for an appointed season, only until an utter end shall be poured out upon the desolator. When the set time of that awful judgment shall be past, then shall the sacrifices be restored in a far nobler sense than they had ever before been established. The converted Jews, brought back to their own country, shall acknowledge Jesus as the Messiah; shall be again owned by him as his consort; and shall celebrate, where they heretofore celebrated the typical sacrifices of the Law, the commemorative eucharistic sacrifice of the Gospel in spirit and in truth. Thus it appears, that, even in the very midst of predicting the desolations of Judah at the time of the first advent, this wonderful prophecy looks forward to a day of retribution on the desolator and to the final conversion and restoration of God's ancient people*.

(1.) Such an interpretation of the prophecy is recommended by various considerations.

* Bp. Lloyd, like myself, translates שומם *the desolator;* and supposes the clause to contain a prediction of the future vengeance of God upon the Roman empire under its last head.

It

It is absolutely necessary, as we have just seen, to reconcile the prediction of Daniel with the prediction of Jeremiah. *Other* expositions set them completely at varance: *this* makes them perfectly harmonize together.

It exhibits Daniel in unison both with himself and with all the other ancient prophets who treat of the restoration of the Jews. He elsewhere assigns the period of *three times and a half*, or 1260 *years*, to the duration of the Roman power under the Papacy in its last or broken form; and declares, that the scatterings of God's ancient people should be finished at the end of these same *three times and a half*, during a period of unexampled trouble, and synchronically with the overthrow of the wilful tyrant who was destined to identify himself with the last head of the Roman beast *. The final destruction of the Roman empire therefore is contemporaneous with the conversion and restoration of the Jews. Exactly similar to this is the language held by the other ancient prophets. They uniformly represent the restoration of Judah as synchronizing with the overthrow of a mighty confederacy of God's enemies, which, we are taught by St. John in the Apocalypse, will be composed of the

* Dan. vii. 25. xii. 6, 7, 1. xi. 45. But see my Dissertations on the 1260 years, and on the restoration of the Jews.

Roman

Roman beast under his last head, the false papal prophet, and the vassal kings of the whole *Ecumenè* or Bestial empire. Hence the Jewish Rabbies (and with great justice) have constantly pronounced, that the downfall of Rome would be the rise of Israel*. In short, as Hosea assures us, that the "children "of Israel should tarry many days, without king, "and without ruler, and *without sacrifice*, and "without statue, and without ephod and teraphim; "and should afterwards return, and seek Jehovah "their God and David their king, and should adore "Jehovah and his goodness, in the futurity of "days†:" so does Daniel here predict, that, through the instrumentality of the desolating abomination, *the sacrifice* should indeed be abolished; but that it should only continue to be so, until a full end should be poured out upon the desolator.

It is the very interpretation of the passage, unless I greatly mistake, which is given by our Lord himself. Part of his prophecy, as delivered by St. Luke, evidently appears to be a sort of paraphrastical exposition and application of the latter part of Daniel's prophecy. "When ye shall see Jerusa-"lem compassed with armies, then know that the

* See these matters discussed at large in my work on the restoration of the Jews.

† Hos. iii. 4.

" desolation thereof is nigh—For these be the days " of vengeance, that all things which are written " may be fulfilled—For there shall be great distress " in the land, and wrath upon this people. And " they shall fall by the edge of the sword, and shall " be led away captive into all nations, and Jerusalem " shall be trodden down of the Gentiles, until the times " of the Gentiles be fulfilled *." Here we have a solemn denunciation of *the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans;* a reference to *the previous declarations of former prophets,* particularly Daniel, as we are expressly informed both by St. Matthew and St. Mark; a prediction of *the scattering of the Jews among all nations, and the treading of Jerusalem under foot,* which necessarily involve the abolition of the temple service; and a promise, that matters should not always remain in this state, but only unto a certain appointed time, *until the times of the Gentiles should be fulfilled,* the expiration of which times is universally allowed to synchronize with the expiration of *the three times and a half.* Now, according to the interpretation here proposed, our Lord's prophecy exactly corresponds with that of Daniel, to which he refers: but, according to any other interpretation, it does *not* correspond with it. In place of *the compassing of Jerusalem with armies,*

* Luke xxi. 20, 22, 23, 24.

we

we have *the appearance of the desolating abomination on the border.* In place of *the great distress throughout the land* and *the falling of the people by the edge of the sword,* we have *desolations unto the end of a predetermined war* and *the end of the people with a flood.* In place of *the scattering of the Jews among all nations and the treading of Jerusalem under foot by the Gentiles,* we have *the abolition of the sacrifice and meat-offering.* And, in place of the predicted period of desolation, *until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled,* we have a similarly predicted period of desolation, which is destined to continue *until an utter end shall be poured upon the desolator.* So accurate a correspondence between the prophecy of our Lord and the prophecy of Daniel, provided the present exposition be adopted, certainly gives us reason to suppose, that the last clause in the prediction of the Jewish prophet was understood by Christ in the sense in which I contend it ought to be understood.

Lastly, this interpretation sufficiently removes certain objections (built on the connection of the prophecy with Daniel's previous supplication) to the *general* opinion which has been entertained relative to *the seventy weeks,* however commentators may vary in *subordinate* points.

It has been urged, that the prophecy, having been delivered to Daniel in answer to his prayer and by

way of consolation to him, might be expected to contain matter of *a favourable nature*, whereas it concludes with the most tremendous threats of *utter desolation* *.

This objection is not altogether without weight; but, by the interpretation here proposed, it seems to me to be in a great measure removed. As comfortable an answer to Daniel's petition is given, as could be given consistently with the truth. The Jewish polity, both ecclesiastical and civil, was broken by the Babylonian captivity. In the prophecy, a promise of its speedy restoration is held out, and the coming of the Messiah is definitively announced by the actual specificatien of a term of years. Both these particulars are comfortable *in themselves:* and, if the latter did *not* eventually produce comfort to the people of the prophet, the fault was their own; but the circumstance could not therefore be dissembled. Their rejection of the Messiah brought on their destruction. *This* doubtless is not comfortable intelligence: yet, that it constitutes a part of the prophecy, we have been explicitly taught on the highest possible authority, that of Christ himself. Nevertheless, though *the abomination of desolation* should appear on their border, though their polity was to be a second time dissolv-

* Dr. Blayney's Dissert. p. 59.

ed,

ed, and though the daily sacrifices of the temple service were to be abolished; yet this state of things was not to continue for ever; it was only to remain for a certain defined period, already treated of in a former prediction of Daniel; it was only to be "until an "utter end, and that firmly decided upon, should "be poured upon the desolator." Here the prophecy closes after a comfortable manner. Rejected and almost exterminated as the Jews should be, yet God would not make *a full end* of them, as he would of their enemies. In due time, at the close of the appointed term of 1260 *years*, they should be restored and converted; their great enemy the Roman empire, that had made their country desolate, should, in its last form, be utterly destroyed; sacrifices, far better and more spiritual, than the ancient Levitical sacrifices, should be offered up in Jerusalem; and the latter end of the people should be better than their beginning. Thus it appears, that the sum of the prophecy is of a consolatory nature: and it may be added, that, even if it had been otherwise, it could not reasonably have been expected, that God should reverse the order of his decrees, or even withhold the foreknowledge of the afflictive part of them, merely on account of the piety of Daniel.

But it has been further urged, that, although we might not be bound to expect a *consolatory* revelation in answer to the prophet's supplication, we might

might at least expect that the revelation would be *a reply* to it. Now the supplication respects *the restoration of the Jews from Babylon:* therefore the natural answer to it would be *the promise that they should be speedily restored.* But, according to the usual interpretation, " the petitioner is informed of " an event, very considerable indeed in itself, but " not much to the matter of his petition; namely, " that the Messiah should be put to death for the " sins of mankind; and that, in consequence thereof, " the city should after a while be destroyed, and the " Jewish nation and religion be finally put an end " to *."

It is obvious, that to the main part of this objection the preceding interpretation is not liable, because it exhibits the prophecy as foretelling neither *the cutting off of the Messiah* nor *the final utter extermination of the Jewish people.* And, with respect to the remaining part of it, the prophecy *does* contain an answer to Daniel's petition, though it likewise contains *much more.* Since the period of *the seventy weeks* must plainly be reckoned from the edict for *rebuilding* the holy city, a promise of *that rebuilding* and consequently of *the restoration of Judah* is necessarily involved: *here* therefore is an answer to Daniel's prayer. *Additional* circum-

* Dr. Blayney's Dissert. p. 12.

stances

stances are no doubt revealed: and what then? our Lord himself teaches us that the prophecy contains them *.

(2.) Yet

* Cornelius a Lapide, though he understands the last clause of the prophecy, as it is erroneously translated in the Vulgate, to mean *unto the consummation and the end the desolation shall continue*, advances an opinion somewhat similar to my own. He supposes it to be here predicted, that the desolation of the land of Judèa will continue to the end of the world; and that Antichrist will then rebuild the temple, and there receive the adoration of the Jews of whom he will make himself king. I think him mistaken in eliciting such an opinion from the clause now under consideration, and likewise in his belief of a personal individual Antichrist: but I am much inclined to suspect, that the opinion itself, though *defective* from its omitting to specify the final conversion of the whole Jewish nation after the overthrow and destruction of Antichrist, will *in the main* prove more true than the generality of protestant expositors have been willing to allow.

Mr. Mede, like myself, thinks that this prophecy reaches to the end of *the* 1260 *days:* though, as it appears to me, he deduces his opinion from a part of the prediction which does not warrant it. He renders the last clause of the 26th verse *unto the end of war desolations are determined*, and makes the following comment upon it: " until the end of the fourth kingdom " of the Gentiles, whose last period is that *time times and half* " *a time*, whereof it is said (Dan. vii. 21, 25.) that Antichrist, " *the eyed and mouthed horn should make war with the saints, and* " *prevail against them; and they shall be given into his hand until* " *a time and times and half a time.* Until the end of this war " the

(2.) Yet it may be urged against this interpretation, that the clause *until an utter end shall be poured upon the desolator*, ought to be referred to the immediately preceding clause *upon the border shall be the abomination that maketh desolate*, which I have thrown into a parenthesis, and not to the first clause in the sentence *he shall cause the sacrifice and meat-offering to cease:* that the abomination, as explained by our Lord, has long ceased to be upon the border; and that an utter end has not even yet been poured upon the desolator, the Roman empire still subsisting in its broken form as it is elsewhere predicted by Daniel: consequently, that the last clause ought to be rendered *until an utter end shall be poured upon the desolated*, and that *the desolated* ought to be understood of *the Jewish nation*.

The force of such an objection has been already, in a great measure, broken by the foregoing observations: nevertheless it may be proper to give it a distinct answer. The last clause *must* be referred either to the one, or to the other, of the two preceding clauses; and the word שומם *must* be translated either actively *the desolator*, or passively *the*

" the Jewish desolations are determined." Works. B. iii. p. 705.

He also deduces it, as I do, from the last clause of the 27th verse; though he translates the clause itself and indeed the whole passage differently, and (I think) erroneously.

deso-

desolated. Let us for a moment adopt the interpretation proposed in the objection, and observe the consequence of it. In this case it is foretold, that *the Roman armies should not depart from the Jewish border, until an utter end should be poured upon the desolated Jews.* But, if *this* were foretold by the prophecy, it has never come to pass; for the Roman armies have long since been removed from the border, and an utter end has *not* been poured out upon the Jewish nation, inasmuch as it still wonderfully subsists a distinct and separate people: nay more; Jeremiah, using the very word here employed by Daniel, has positively declared, that an utter end *never shall be* poured out upon that nation. Hence it is evident, that Daniel could not mean to teach us, that *the Romans should not leave Judæa until an utter end was poured upon the Jews.* It will follow therefore, that שומם ought not to be rendered *the desolated;* because, if so rendered, it *must* relate to *the Jews.* But, if it ought not to be rendered *the desolated,* it can only be rendered *the desolator.* And, if it be rendered *the desolator,* it must relate to *the Romans.* And, if it relate to *the Romans,* then the whole clause *until an utter end shall be poured upon the desolator* cannot be referred to the immediately preceding cause *upon the border shall be the abomination that maketh desolate;* because the abomination has long ceased to be upon the

the border, and an utter end is not *even yet* poured upon the Roman empire. Therefore finally the clause *until an utter end shall be poured upon the desolator* must be referred to the first clause *he shall cause the sacrifice and meat-offering to cease.* Such accordingly is the manner in which I have referred it; and on this account I have thrown the middle clause *upon the border shall be the abomination that maketh desolate* into a parenthesis for the sake of perspicuity, conceiving it to point out the instrumental cause of the abolition of the temple sacrifices.

4. Upon *the utter end that is to be poured upon the desolator* Daniel bestows the same epithet, that he had already bestowed upon the *Jewish war* *: he styles it *firmly decided upon.* This I conceive him to do exactly in the same sense, as he had a little before similarly designated *the war.* As *the war* was predetermined in the counsels of God, and expressly foretold by his holy prophets; so likewise was *the utter end destined to be poured upon the desolator.* There is scarcely one of the ancient prophets, who does not predict it†: Daniel himself represents it as being the close of that portentous tyranny, which God had permitted to be successively exercised by four great empires; and describes it, since the wilful

* Ver. 26.

† See my work on the restoration of the Jews.

king

king is now plainly identified with the last head of the Roman beast, as synchronizing with the restoration of the Jews *: while St. John, when closing the canon of Scripture, foretells it repeatedly with a most elaborate minuteness of detail †. The epithet seems to have been twice applied purposely, and (as it were) antithetically. Though the end of the Jews (that is, their end as a body politic, not as a nation) should be with a flood, and though desolations should be unto the end of the war *firmly predetermined:* yet, notwithstanding the success of their enemy, his eventual destruction was no less sure; the utter end of the desolator was no less *firmly predetermined* than the war itself.

VII. It may not be amiss, at the close of my interpretation of this remarkable prophecy, briefly to recapitulate what has been said in the form of a paraphrase.

1. *Weeks seventy are the precise period upon thy people and upon thy holy city*, being the appointed time of 490 years during which the mystical Jerusalem, the Levitical polity, should be accounted holy unto God after its re-establishment. Within this period various important matters are to be accom-

* Dan. ii. 35, 44, 45—vii. 9—14, 21, 22, 24—27—xi. 45. xii. 1, 6, 7.

† Rev. xiii. 5, 10. xvii. xviii. xix.

plished;

plished; and, since it is the appointed time for the accomplishment of them all, its termination must be marked by the accomplishment of the chronologically latest of them. It is appointed *to complete the apostasy* of thy people; for, bad as their former idolatrous apostasies may have been, the sum of their wickedness must hereafter be completed by a yet blacker act of apostasy. It is appointed moreover *to perfect the sin-offerings*, by the sacrificing of that great sin-offering of which all those under the Law were mere shadows. It is appointed also *to make atonement for iniquity*, to make that real reconciliation between God and sinful man, of which the various legal atonements were only types. It is further appointed *to cause the righteousness of the eternal ages to come*, that personal righteousness, the just One of God, the Shiloh whose coming is the theme of so many of the ancient prophets. It is appointed likewise *to seal the vision and the prophet*, to authenticate both this vision and all the other visions descriptive of the Saviour that should come, and to authenticate also the great prophet himself when manifested in the fulness of time. It is lastly appointed *to anoint the Most Holy One*, to inaugurate with due solemnity the Saviour of mankind into his several offices of king, priest, and prophet.

2. *But know and understand, from the going forth of an edict to rebuild Jerusalem*, from the enacting

enacting of a decree to reëstablish the mystic holy city, the now broken Levitical polity, in the seventh year of Artaxerxes which corresponds with the year 4256 of the Julian period, *unto the Anointed One the Prince*, unto his official coming in the first preaching of the Gospel, *shall be weeks seven and weeks sixty and two*, or 483 years, the preaching of the Gospel by John the Baptist commencing in the year 4739 of the Julian period. As for the mystic holy city, *it shall be rebuilt, with perpetual increase and firm decision*, the reëstablishment of the Levitical polity being carried on in spite of opposition by the firmness of those to whom the task shall be committed, *even in the short space of the times*, in the course of the seven weeks or 49 years, the last act of reformation taking place about the year 4305 of the Julian period.

3. *And, after the weeks seven and the weeks sixty and two*, after the expiration of the 483 years when the preaching of the Gospel is to commence, *the Anointed One shall cut off by divorce, so that they shall be no more his, both the city and the sanctuary.* Coming unto his own, he shall not be received by them: therefore shall he issue out a bill of divorce against his mystic consort the Levitical Church from the very first of his ministerial coming; though, willing to give her time for repentance, he shall not immediately ratify it, but shall suffer her still to be called

the

the holy city, until the end of her appointed times the 490 years, until she hath finally completed her apostasy.

4. Marvel not however at this just severity. *The people of the Prince that shall come*, even the people of Messiah, *shall act corruptly:* they shall proceed from one wickedness unto another, until they fill up the measure of their iniquities by crucifying the Lord of life. *But their end*, as a body politic, though not as a distinct people, *shall be with a flood*, with a tremendous invasion of their enemies. *And* dreadful *desolations shall be unto the* very *end of a war firmly decided upon*, a war absolutely predetermined in the divine counsels.

5. *Yet*, notwithstanding this divorce of his mystic consort, notwithstanding the miseries that shall thereupon befall his ancient people, *he shall make firm a covenant with many for one week*, even the last week of the seventy, by the ministration of the Gospel; at the close of which, by his perfecting the sin-offerings and by his making atonement for iniquity on the cross, he shall complete the last of the predicted particulars of the seventy weeks in the year 4746 of the Julian period.

6. I have now explained to thee all the occurrences that belong to the seventy weeks; but there is another important period wholly distinct from them, to which I must also call thy attention. *In half a week*

week he shall cause the sacrifice and meat-offering to cease (for upon the border shall be the abomination that maketh desolate) even until an utter end, and that firmly decided upon, shall be poured upon the desolator. At the close of three years and a half reckoned from the commencement of the Jewish war by Vespasian (for such is the period required to bring about this great event) he will abolish the sacrifice and meat-offering; for Jerusalem shall be compassed by his instruments the Roman armies. Yet their abolition shall not be perpetual: it shall only continue until a full destruction shall have been poured out upon the desolator himself. For know to thy comfort, that he also in his turn shall experience the vengeance of God. His utter end is no less predetermined by heaven than the war which he shall conduct against thy people. His fall shall be their rise. And at length the daily sacrifice shall again be offered up in Jerusalem in a more noble and spiritual sense than ever it has hitherto been.

CHAPTER

CHAPTER VII.

An examination of the objections which may be made to the preceding interpretation.

THE objections, which may be made to the preceding interpretation, have in a great measure been anticipated in the course of it: yet, for the sake of greater precision, it may not be useless or improper to give them a distinct consideration.

I. The first objection, which I shall notice as being the most important, is that which may be made to *the mystic interpretation of Jerusalem*, the explaining *the holy city*, whenever it occurs in the course of the prophecy, to mean, not *the literal town of Jerusalem*, but *the Levitical polity ecclesiastical and civil.* In this explanation I agree with Dr. Prideaux: but Dr. Blayney strongly remarks, that "he can never be brought to acquiesce in it, whilst "a literal construction is admissible*."

This objection can only be made, either on the general ground that such an explanation of *the holy*

* Dissert. p. 37.

city

city is altogether inadmissible, or on the particular ground that it is inadmissible in the present instance. The first is not pretended to be the case: the second therefore must plainly be the basis of the objection in question. We have only therefore to inquire, how far such an interpretation is warrantable in the case of the prophecy of *the seventy weeks.*

1. Were we to judge the matter *abstractedly*, it would perhaps be difficult to assign any very satisfactory reason, why in this passage *alone* a figurative interpretation should be *absolutely inadmissible:* when in so *many* other passages, relating to the parallel circumstance of the reëstablishment of Judah in the last ages, *the rebuilding of Jerusalem* must necessarily be explained in a figurative manner; and when we find James himself, in the case of least *one* prophecy, applying the imagery of *rebuilding the tabernacle of David which was fallen down* to *the establishment of the Christian Church among the Gentiles**. With these apparently parallel

* " Men and brethren, hearken unto me: Simeon hath de-
" clared, how God at the first did visit the Gentiles, to take
" out of them a people for his name. And to this agree the
" words of the prophets; as it is written, After this I will re-
" turn, and will build again the tabernacle of David which is
" fallen down; and I will build again the ruins thereof, and
" I will set it up: that the residue of men might seek after the

 " Lord,

rallel passages before us, it is, I say, difficult to conceive, why it should be thought so very unnatural in Daniel to represent *the reëstablishment of the fallen Levitical polity* under the same imagery.

2. But, unless I greatly mistake, a much more positive and decisive argument than this may be produced—It has been shewn, that *the seventy weeks* must look *prospectively* *. It has also been shewn, that, looking as they do *prospectively*, they must terminate with the *chronologically latest* of the circumstances which are to be accomplished within their period †. And it has moreover been shewn, that the *chronologically latest* of those circumstances synchronize with *the death of Christ* ‡. Therefore *the death of Christ* must mark the termination of *the seventy weeks*—But, if *the death of Christ* mark the termination of *the seventy weeks*, then 490 years counted backward from that event must bring us to the granting of that edict to rebuild Jerusalem which Daniel specifies as the date of *the seventy weeks*. Now 490 years counted backward from the crucifixion bring us, with the minute exactness even

" Lord, and all the Gentiles upon whom my name is called, " saith the Lord, who doeth all these things." Acts xv. 13—17.

* According to the 1st abstract position.

† According to the 2d abstract position.

‡ See Chap. vi. § I. 2.

of

of a month, to the going forth of the decree in the seventh year of Artaxerxes. Therefore *this decree* must be *the edict to rebuild Jerusalem* assigned by Daniel as the date of *the seventy weeks*—But this decree enacts *the reëstablishment of the Levitical polity both civil and ecclesiastical*, and is wholly silent with respect to *the rebuilding of the literal Jerusalem*. Therefore *the Jerusalem*, which Daniel's prophecy speaks of as destined to be rebuilt in pursuance of that edict, cannot be *the literal Jerusalem*, but must be *the Levitical polity* or *the figurative Jerusalem;* for no rebuilding of any *other* Jerusalem is mentioned in the edict.

(1.) To this argument two corollaries may be added—As Daniel's *three times and a half* are the times of the little horn, so by analogy his *seventy weeks* must be the times of the holy city. But, if by the *holy city* the *literal Jerusalem* be intended, *its* times, reckoning from the commencement of its rebuilding in pursuance of the edict of Cyrus to its destruction by Titus, were not merely seventy prophetic weeks or 490 years, but 605 years: whereas the times of the Levitical polity, from the beginning of its reëstablishment under Ezra to its ceasing to be the holy city of God by completing its apostasy, are exactly 490 years. Therefore *the Jerusalem* of the present prophecy must be *the figurative Jerusalem*.

(2.) So again: Messiah is said to divorce the city and the sanctuary at the end of *the sixty nine weeks. This city* must be the same as *the city that is rebuilt.* But *the city divorced* cannot be *the mere town of Jerusalem,* but must plainly be *the figurative Jerusalem* or *the Levitical polity.* Therefore *the city that is rebuilt* must be *the figurative Jerusalem* likewise.

To this it may be objected, that I deduce an argument from my own particular interpretation of the passage: therefore, if the propriety of the interpretation be denied, the argument falls to the ground.

That such is the case, I readily allow: but I maintain, that no other interpretation of the passage is tenable—Whatever be its precise meaning, it undoubtedly must relate to something that begins to take place exactly at the end of *the sixty nine weeks*—Now it can only be translated *Messiah shall cut off*, or *Messiah shall be cut off;* according as יִכָּרֵת is esteemed the future of *Kal* or *Niphal*—It cannot be translated *Messiah shall be cut off*, because Messiah was not put to death at the end of *the sixty nine weeks*, but at the end of *the seventy weeks;* a position, which necessarily follows from the crucifixion synchronizing with the chronologically latest of the particulars destined to be accomplished within the period of *the seventy weeks.* Besides,

sides, since *the sixty nine weeks* bring us *unto the Messiah,* they cannot likewise bring us *unto his death;* because, in that case, no time will be allowed for his ministry. Nor is this all. Those, who adopt so incongruous an opinion, are still unable to make the crucifixion coincide with the expiration of *the sixty nine weeks,* even after they have had recourse to the inadmissible mode of computation by years of 360 days each—But, if the passage cannot be translated *Messiah shall be cut off,* it must be translated *Messiah shall cut off*—Now this translation is capable of only two meanings, *cutting off by excision,* or *cutting off by divorce*—The expression, as it here occurs, cannot mean *cutting off by excision:* because the Messiah did not by his righteous judgments destroy the Jewish state at the end of the *sixty nine weeks,* the time assigned in the prophecy, but several years after the expiration even of *the seventy weeks*—Therefore it must mean *cutting off by divorce*—And, if it mean *cutting off by divorce,* then the city so cut off must plainly be a figurative city. And, if the divorced city be a figurative city, then the city destined to be rebuilt, being evidently the same as the divorced city, must be a figurative city likewise; and, by parity of reasoning, its rebuilding must be a figurative rebuilding.

II. Out

II. Out of this corollary a second objection may possibly arise—The times of the Levitical polity, as the holy city of God, are *seventy weeks:* but, if the Levitical polity be divorced at the end of *the sixty nine weeks*, then *seventy weeks* cannot be said to be its precise period as the holy city, inasmuch as it would cease to be the holy city at the end of *the sixty nine weeks*, when it was divorced.

I reply, that, since a divorce is a legal action not thoroughly effected until certain appointed formalities have been gone through, whenever the term is used metaphorically in Scripture, we must suppose a close resemblance between the metaphorical divorce and a literal legal divorce. Now, when a wife has committed adultery, a certain time must unavoidably elapse, between the first step which the injured husband takes to procure a divorce, and the final pronouncing of that divorce by a court of law. So far then as a complete separation from bed and board is considered, the husband divorces his adulterous wife from the first moment that he commences a process against her; but, in the eye of the law she is still his wife until the bill of divorce be duly executed, and the sentence of repudiation formally pronounced *. Exactly in this manner I understand

* The law of divorce among the Jews plainly supposes, that a certain time would be occupied in preparing with due formality.

stand the Messiah's divorce of the Levitical church. He *commenced* his process against her from the first moment

lity the proper instrument. " When a man hath taken a wife " and married her, and it come to pass that she find no favour " in his eyes, because he hath found some uncleanness in her; " then let him write her a bill of divorcement, and give it in " her hand, and send her out of his house." Deut. xxiv. 1.

So accordingly in practice the Jews understood this law. " To prevent the abuse which the Jewish men might make of " this liberty of divorcing, the Rabbins appoint many forma- " lities, which consume much time, and give the married cou- " ple leisure to be reconciled. Where there is no hope of ac- " commodation, a woman, a deaf man, or a notary, draws the " letter of divorce. He writes it in the presence of one or " more Rabbins, on vellum ruled, containing only twelve lines, " in square letters: and abundance of little trifling particulars " are observed, as well in the characters as in the manner of " writing, and in the names and sirnames of the husband and " wife. The substance of this letter, which they call *Gheth*, " is as follows: *In such a day, month, year, and place, I* N. " *divorce you voluntarily, put you away, restore you to your li-* " *berty, even you* N. *who were heretofore my wife, and I permit* " *you to marry whom you please.* The letter being written, the " Rabbi examines the husband closely, in order to learn whe- " ther he is voluntarily inclined to do what he has done. " They endeavour to have at least ten persons present at this " action, without reckoning the two witnesses who sign, and " two other witnesses to the date. After which the Rabbi " commands the wife to open her hands, and bring them close " to one another, in order to receive this deed, lest it fall to " the ground: and, after having examined her over again, the " husband gives her the parchment, and says to her, *Here is*

" *thy*

moment of her rejecting him, that is to say, from the first moment of the preaching of the Gospel: hence it is said, that he should divorce the city and the sanctuary exactly after the expiration of *the sixty nine weeks*. But the *completing* of the business was a work of time; the sentence of repudiation was not finally pronounced, until the Jews specifically rejected him, first by declaring that they had no king but Cesar, and afterwards by completing their apostasy at his crucifixion: hence, in the eye of the law the Levitical Church being his consort to the very end of *the seventy weeks*, though the process of repudiation commenced at the end of *the sixty nine weeks*, her times, as the holy city, are still limited to *seventy precise weeks*. When those weeks expired, the bill of divorce, which had been preparing during the whole of *the last week*, was ratified; and the repudiated Levitical Church ceased to be the holy city of God.

III. A third objection may be made to the deficiency of proof, that the rebuilding of the figurative Jerusalem was completed exactly at the end of

" *thy divorce, I put thee away from me, and leave thee at liberty* " *to marry whom thou pleasest*. The wife takes it, and gives it " to the Rabbi, who reads it once more; after which she is " free. Many little circumstances we omit, they being in- " vented only to increase difficulty." Calmet's Dictionary, Vox *Divorce*.

seven

seven weeks or 49 years, according to the prophetic declaration that *it should be rebuilt in the short space of the times.*

I might, in a degree, elude this objection by translating the clause, with Dr. Blayney and our common English version, *it shall be rebuilt in times of distress,* and by referring those *times of distress* or *troublous times* to the pertinacious opposition made to the work by the surrounding nations, and to the many vexations which Nemehiah particularly experienced in his work of reformation from the Jews themselves. But I allow, that such an answer would not be quite satisfactory: because it might still be urged, and with great justice, that *the sixty nine weeks* would have been expressed simply *sixty nine weeks,* not dividedly *seven weeks and sixty two weeks,* unless there had been some good reason for separating *the seven weeks* from *the sixty two weeks.* I will therefore freely confess, that it is impossible to *prove* from history, that Nehemiah's last act of reformation was accomplished precisely at the end of 49 years from the going forth of the edict in the seventh year of Artaxerxes. All that can be said is this, that we know it must have been accomplished *about* that time. Could it indeed be proved from history, that it was *not* then accomplished, some doubt might be thrown upon the propriety of the interpretation here adopted: but its non-accomplishment

plishment in that year can be no more proved than its accomplishment. And, even if it *could* be proved, it would not *therefore* necessarily overturn the whole exposition. It would shew indeed decidedly, that *the seven weeks* did not relate to the rebuilding of the city, and consequently that the clause ought not to be rendered *it shall be rebuilt in the short space of the times:* but it would undoubtedly shew nothing more; and the exposition itself might in all its leading particulars be perfectly just, though we might not be able positively to say on account of what event *the seven weeks* were separated from *the sixty two weeks.* All things however considered, the evidence appears to me sufficiently strong to warrant our placing Nehemiah's last act of reformation at the end of *the seven weeks.* The sum of it is this. *The seventy weeks*, as I have shewn, *must* be reckoned prospectively. They *must* terminate with the chronologically latest of the circumstances, which are destined to be accomplished within their period. They *must* therefore terminate with the crucifixion, because the crucifixion synchronizes with the chronologically latest of the circumstances. Hence they *must* commence with the going forth of the edict in the seventh year of Artaxerxes. Hence *the sixty nine weeks* also *must* terminate with the beginning of the Gospel ministry. Now in every one of these points we find an accurate

rate coincidence. If 490 years, reckoned backward from the crucifixion, did *not* bring us to the enacting of any decree, we should then be sure that the crucifixion was not the last event of *the seventy weeks*, and that we had erred in supposing it to be so. But, when we find that it brings us, with the exactness even of a month, to the enacting of a decree to reëstablish the Levitical polity, we may be tolerably sure that we have ascertained the intended period of *seventy weeks*. *Sixty nine weeks* however of *the seventy* are to bring us *unto the Messiah*. The expression itself, though it must mean *unto his coming* in *some* sense, is *a priori* ambiguous. Yet, if we find upon computing this smaller period that we are brought to no event which will in any manner quadrate with the expression *unto the Messiah*, we shall undoubtedly have reason to suspect, that the 490 years between the edict of Artaxerxes and the crucifixion are not the intended period of *seventy weeks*, but that their numerical correspondence with each other is purely casual. If, on the other hand, we find, as we *do* find, that we are brought to an event which perfectly quadrates with the expression; *the sixty nine weeks* (to use a technical arithmetical term) then plainly *check* the *seventy weeks*, and we arrive at moral certainty that the intended period of *the seventy weeks* has been ascertained. In this state of the case we are informed,

formed, that the rebuilding of the holy city should be completed in *seven weeks* or 49 years from the going forth of the edict. Upon adverting to history, we find ourselves unable to *prove* this to have been actually the case; but we *do* find ourselves able to *prove* that the work must have been completed *about* that time, and we moreover know that the fact can never be *disproved.* Now, whether this *deficiency of absolute proof*, not *the existence of any absolute disproof*, would be allowed in any court of law to outweigh the mass of *positive evidence* which has been adduced, may, I think, be very reasonably denied. At least, if this lack of absolute proof *do* outweigh the mass of positive evidence, I am at a loss to conceive by what laws of evidence the majority of historical facts are acknowledged to be moral truths.

I may here observe, by the way, that, unless *the holy city* be understood figuratively, it is difficult to form any idea how it could be said to be rebuilt in exactly 49 years. We can determine when *a temple* or *a house* is completely rebuilt, but how can we determine when *a ruined city* is completely rebuilt? What particular house or street must be finished to mark such completion; so that, *previous* to the house or street being finished, the city was *not* completely rebuilt; but, subsequent to the house or street being finished, the city *was* completely rebuilt?

built? At what precise point shall we fix its completion? When was the rebuilding of London, after the great fire, completed? When was the rebuilding of Jerusalem, after its demolition by Nebuchadnezzar, completed? London has continued increasing to the present day. Jerusalem continued increasing until it was destroyed by Titus. So much indeed did it increase, that it was very considerably larger, when its siege by the Romans commenced, than it had been even during the most prosperous reigns of its native sovereigns *.

IV. A fourth objection may be made to the referring *the last week* of *the seventy* to the period of the ministration of the Gospel first by John the Baptist and afterwards by our Lord in his own person, on the ground that *this week* is interposed in the midst of those parts of the prophecy which plainly relate to the Jewish war, the siege of Jerusalem, and the abolition of the temple service †.

My answer is, that the arrangement of *this week* in the prediction is not unnatural, when we consider

* "Jerusalem, from a mean beginning, repeopled with a "few impoverished inhabitants just returned from exile, was "enabled to hold up its head, and daily to improve in consi- "deration and figure; till it was advanced at length to such "a pitch of splendour, magnificence, and strength, as it never "had known before, even under the most powerful and inde- "pendent of its monarchs." Dr. Blayney's Dissert. p. 38.

† See Dr. Blayney's Dissert. p. 16.

the

the preceding context. Nothing is more common, than for a writer to be hurried on by some prominent circumstance to anticipate the mention of certain matters closely connected with it, afterwards to return to the point which ought in absolute strictness of chronology to have been first handled, and then to resume in their proper place and with greater minuteness of detail the discussion of those matters which had already been touched upon proleptically. Exactly such seems to be the case in the present instance. The mention of *Messiah's divorce of the holy city* at the end of *the sixty nine weeks* naturally leads the prophet to state the reason of it, namely *the gross corruption of the people:* and the mention of their gross corruption, which was at length consummated in the rejection and murder of their anointed Prince, leads him no less naturally to foretell proleptically *their destruction.* But, before he enters into the particulars of that destruction, he checks himself, and returns to *the seventieth week,* which he had hitherto, hurried on by his subject, left unnoticed. Having specified that in *this week* Messiah should make firm a covenant with many, notwithstanding his divorce of the holy city, he resumes his account of that end of the Jewish nation which was to be with a flood. He teaches us, that by reason of *the desolating abomination* being upon the border the sacrifice and meat-offering should be

abolished in *half a week;* which the context shews plainly to be a certain portion of the space of that firmly predetermined war already mentioned, to the end of which there should be desolations. And he concludes with declaring, that, although the sacrifices should certainly be abolished, that state of things should not last for ever, but only until an utter end should in *his* turn be poured upon the desolator. From this statement the interposition of *the last week* appears to be no violation of the rules of good historic writing; and by such a test prophecy, which is simply anticipated history, must undoubtedly be tried.

But it may further be remarked, that the present mode of interpretation, even were it less capable of defence than it is by the rules of good writing, must necessarily be adopted. That *the end of the people with a flood* and *the unceasingly desolating war* relate to *the destruction of the Jewish nation*, is doubted by no commentator. *The week* then, during which the Messiah was to make a firm covenant with many, must either *synchronize* with the Jewish war, or *precede* it. It cannot *synchronize* with it: because, in that case, it must be completely separated from the preceding *sixty nine weeks*, and thus the continuity of *the seventy weeks* must be broken; an hypothesis altogether intolerable *. Therefore

* According to the 6th abstract position.

it

it must *precede* it. And, if it *precede* it, then the present mode of interpretation cannot but be adopted.

V. Here however a fifth objection may be made to my considering *the half week* which brings about the abolition of the sacrifice and meat-offering, as perfectly distinct from any part of *the week* during which Messiah is to make firm a covenant with many. For it may be urged, that the context of the passage most naturally requires us to suppose, that this *half week* is either *the former* or *the latter half* of *the week* just before mentioned.

I reply, that the ground of their supposed identity appears only in our common English translation, which renders the original phrase "in the midst "of *the* week," instead of "in the midst," or rather "in the half of *a* week:" whence, according to such a version, *the half week* seems of course to be *the half of the last mentioned week*. But, that this is *not* the case, is manifest from the following considerations—*The week, during which Messiah makes firm a covenant with many*, being the last of *the seventy weeks*, must expire when *the seventy weeks* expire; that is to say, unless the continuity of *the seventy weeks* be broken, it must expire with the *chronologically latest* of the circumstances destined to be accomplished within *the seventy weeks**: but

* According to the 6th and 2d abstract positions.

the

the *chronologically latest* of those circumstances have been shewn to synchronize with *the crucifixion;* therefore *the week* in question must expire with *the crucifixion*—On the other hand, *the half week, which brings about the abolition of the sacrifice and meat-offering,* must no doubt at its close synchronize with their abolition: but their abolition so far synchronizes with the appearance of *the desolating abomination,* as to be caused by it*: therefore *the half week* must synchronize with the appearance of *the desolating abomination,* so far as it causes the abolition of the daily sacrifice. But the first appearance of *the desolating abomination* is represented by our Lord as preceding a siege of Jerusalem: therefore, if not its short siege by Cestius, yet its siege which brought about the abolition of the daily sacrifice must take place in *the half week* —Hence it will follow, that *the half week,* in which the siege of Jerusalem by Titus takes place, being *the half week which brings about the abolition of the daily sacrifice,* cannot be *either half* of *the week which terminates with the crucifixion.* In other words, *the week, in which Messiah makes firm a covenant with many,* must be a wholly distinct period from *the half week which produces the abolition of the sacrifice and meat-offering.*

* According to the 12th abstract position.

Nor need it be thought strange that a second distinct period should be mentioned in this prophecy. It is usually indeed styled *the prophecy of the seventy weeks:* whence apparently some commentators have thought it necessary, though by different contrivances indeed, to make the prophecy terminate with the expiration of *the seventy weeks*. But, although such be the name which it usually bears, the circumstance most assuredly does not prove that *the prophecy* and *the seventy weeks* terminate synchronically. On the contrary, to me the prophecy appears most plainly to reach *beyond* the end of *the seventy weeks;* and *that*, not merely to *the close of the Jewish war*, but, like all the other predictions of Daniel, to *the final downfall of the last of the four great monarchies**.

VI. There

* It has been objected to Scaliger, with sufficient absurdity, that, by assuming another period to be mentioned in the prophecy besides that of *the seventy weeks*, he is adding to Scripture, and thereby incurring the denunciation of Rev. xxii. 18. That such is not the case, the most cursory survey of the prophecy is sufficient to shew. *Seventy weeks* are first mentioned, as being the precise times of the holy city, and as being the appointed period within which certain specified particulars are to be accomplished. Afterwards we read of *seven weeks*, *sixty two weeks*, *a single week* in which Messiah was to make firm a covenant with many, and *a half week* which was to bring about the abolition of the sacrifice and meat-offering. Hence it is manifest, that either *seventy weeks only* are mentioned in the prophecy;

VI. There remains only another objection, which has already been so fully considered, that it may seem almost superfluous to notice it again: I mean the objection urged by some commentators to the mode of computation here adopted (which, by taking the intercalations into the account, makes seventy weeks of Jewish years equal in the gross sum to 490 solar years), on the ground that *the seventy weeks* ought to be computed by lunar years of 360 days each and are therefore equal to only about 483 solar years.

Independent of every other consideration, the prophecy itself affords an abundantly sufficient answer to this objection. We have seen, that *the seventy weeks must* be reckoned prospectively. We have seen, that they *must* terminate with the latest of the six several circumstances destined to be accomplished within their period. And we have seen, that the latest of those circumstances *must* synchronize with the crucifixion. Hence it will follow, that the crucifixion *must* mark the termination of *the seventy weeks*. Now, if we compute backward from

prophecy, or *seventy weeks and an additional half week subsequent to the seventy weeks*, according as *the half week* and *a half of the seventieth week* are considered as being *one and the same period* or as being *two distinct periods*. Which of these is the case, can only, as it appears to me, be ascertained by a discussion of the prophecy.

this era 490 lunar years, whether consisting of 354 or 360 days each, we shall not arrive at any epoch which can properly be considered as the date of *the seventy weeks;* because their specified date is the going forth of an edict to rebuild Jerusalem, and no edict of any kind went forth at either of the epochs to which we are brought by these two modes of lunar computation. But, if we compute backward from the era of the crucifixion 490 solar years, we shall be brought, with the minute exactness even of a month, to the going forth of the edict in the seventh year of Artaxerxes Longimanus, by virtue of which the figurative holy city or the Levitical polity was reëstablished in both its branches. Nor do I conceive that this argument partakes of the nature of the circulating syllogism, merely because I thought it adviseable to discuss *a priori* and *in the abstract* the proper mode of computing prophetic periods. If once we can ascertain the termination of any period the commencement of which has a specific date assigned to it, it is obvious that a retrograde calculation will decidedly establish the true average length of the years which compose the period in question. For, if we compute by years of a particular length, and find that they do not bring us to any epoch which will correspond with the specified date; we may be sure, that *those* years are not the years intended by the prophet. And,

And, if we make a second essay and compute by other years of a different particular length, and *then* find that they bring us to an epoch which exactly corresponds with the specified date; we may in that case be sure that we have discovered the years of which the prophet meant the period to consist.

CHAPTER

CHAPTER VIII.

Observations by way of conclusion.

ONE can scarcely close a long-protracted discussion of this very interesting and important prophecy without offering a few observations upon it by way of conclusion.

1. Many persons seem to have taken up a strange notion, that it is lost labour to attempt to explain the predictions of the Apocalypse and the parallel predictions of Daniel because their very obscurity shews that they are not yet accomplished; and urge in favour of this crude idea, that, whenever they *are* accomplished, all obscurity will vanish, that *then* there will be no differences of opinion among commentators, and that they will be so plain that *he that runneth may read.*

The examination of the prophecy of *the seventy weeks* effectually exposes the futility of such an opinion. All *Christians* allow it to be accomplished; accomplished at least so far, that the specified period must have long since run out, and that the predicted desolations must have come upon Jerusalem:

salem: and all *Jews* must, inasmuch as it is in part a numerical prophecy, either allow it to be in a great measure accomplished, or deny its divine inspiration. Yet there are few predictions, which have more exercised the wit of commentators; few, concerning which there has been a greater variety of opinions. Accomplished as it undoubtedly is for the most part, it is by no means on that account so plain that it may be understood without the labour of investigation: *he that runneth*, the careless observer, is still as unable to *read* it, as he was before its accomplishment. It is not difficult to point out the reason of this, and thus to expose the superficial notion of *the perfect plainness of an accomplished prophecy;* a notion, the genuine offspring (I believe) of indolence and hatred of trouble. To note the completion of predictions *purely descriptive* requires no mental toil. Idleness herself may compare the 53d chapter of Isaiah for instance with the history contained in the Gospels, and may be struck with the minute correspondence of the prophecy and the event; for it is obvious, that to discover *this* correspondence not a grain of exertion is necessary: and, when both the common humour of mankind and the opportunities of the generality are considered, most thankful ought we to be to the good Providence of God that such *is* the case. But, when history is to be ransacked, when difficult chronological

chronological points are to be discussed, when synchronisms are to be ascertained, when the true meaning of obscure phrases is to be elicited, and when the import of symbolical language is to be determined; however richly the toil either of the commentator or of his reader may be rewarded, still such inquiries are and must be a toil. Whenever the whole volume of the Apocalypse shall be accomplished, to the indolent and the supine it will still be as a sealed book. They may indeed *then* fully *believe* it to be accomplished: but, as for *the manner* of its accomplishment, they will *without labour* be just as profoundly ignorant of it, as many Christians at the present day are of the manner in which the prophecy of *the seventy weeks* has been accomplished in the advent and death of the Messiah, though they may duly believe that it *has* been so accomplished *.

2. The probability is, that the restoration and conversion of the Jews is not very far distant. They would do well therefore to turn their serious attention to this remarkable prophecy contained in

* It was excellently remarked by Bp. Sherlock, that "a "figurative and dark description of a future event will be "figurative and dark still when the event happens;" and that "no event can make a figurative or metaphorical expression "to be a plain or a literal one." Discourses on prophecy. Disc. ii. p. 32, 36.

their

their own Scriptures. Prejudice *may* shut the eyes against the clearest *circumstantial* evidence; and a Jew may be unable to discover in the predictions of Isaiah any thing that resembles the events detailed in the history of him whom Christians acknowledge as the Messiah. But the case is different with *numerical* evidence. *Circumstantial* evidence resembles moral truth, of which there may be an infinite variety of shades. *Numerical* evidence resembles mathematical truth, which admits of no shades: its boast is unity and perfection; if it be not absolute unmixed truth, it is palpable falshood. A Jew may conceive, hard as it may be to a Christian to comprehend the possibility of such a thing; yet a Jew *may* conceive, that the predictions of a suffering Messiah were not accomplished in Jesus of Nazareth, but that they will at length receive their accomplishment in his imaginary Messiah Ben-Joseph. But the stubbornness of *numbers* bids defiance to the mischievous ingenuity of the most determined prejudice. *Either the Messiah must be come, or Daniel was a false prophet.* No other alternative is possible: no evasion is practicable. To every subterfuge, to every reply that can be painfully framed by the Hebrew writhing under the lash of incontrovertible evidence, the unbending rigidity of mathematical demonstration still proclaims aloud, *Either the Messiah must be come, or Daniel was a false*

false prophet. Compute *the seventy weeks* as you will; divide them, and subdivide them, as you please; admit, or reject, intercalations; take solar years, or take lunar years; reckon from whatever edict you most affect; perplex chronology as much as you think proper; curtail, with your brethren in the days of Adrian, the Persian monarchy by 200 years, to put off the evil day of the expiration of these *seventy weeks:* still will the refractory number refuse either to bend or to break. Long since must the fated *seventy weeks* have expired according to *any* hypothesis that can be contrived. How then can the Jews deny that the Messiah is come, consistently with their belief in the divine inspiration of Daniel?

An anathema is pronounced against those who presume to compute the prophet's numbers! The language of the revealing angel is, *Know and understand:* the language of the modern teachers in Israel is, *Cursed is he who attempts to understand!* Yet it was not always thus. The ancient Jews scrupled not to compute the mystic number: and it is plain that they computed it on the same principles that Christians do now. For how else can we so satisfactorily account for the uninterrupted expectation of the Messiah, which commenced about 50 years before the birth of Jesus, as early as consistently with the prophecy it *could* commence, and which continued

continued to the very desolation of Jerusalem? Long since have the sacrifice and meat-offering been abolished, punctually as Daniel foretold. With what consistency then shall his prophecy be allowed to be accomplished in *one* point (and in *this* point it *must* be allowed to be accomplished), while it is denied to be accomplished in another point? If the sacrifice and meat-offering be abolished, Messiah must be come: because his coming is plainly described as *preceding* such abolition. Will the Jew deny that they *are* abolished? If facts extort the unwilling confession, how will he consistently deny that Messiah has indeed been manifested in the person of Jesus? Let him now at length in these latter days seriously weigh this important prophecy: and let him jointly compare both it, his present condition, and his future expectations, with those memorable words of Hosea, "Many days "shall the children of Israel tarry without king, "and without ruler, and without sacrifice, and without statue, and without ephod and teraphim: "afterward shall the children of Israel return, and "seek Jehovah their God, and David their king, "and adore Jehovah and his goodness in the futu- "rity of days."

3. Since Christians have such an irrefragable, such a palpable, proof of the divine mission of their Saviour, let them beware lest they rest in a mere name,

name, while they are ignorant of the power of religion. The Levitical Church has been repudiated, and another and more spiritual Church has been espoused in its room. Let its members recollect the terms upon which they stand, and be careful lest *their* candlestick also be removed out of its place. Let them seek to inherit the promises *in conjunction* with the converted of Judah, not provoke God to *reject* them when he brings back the captivity of his ancient people. " If some of the " branches be broken off, and thou being a wild " olive-tree wert graffed in among them, and with " them partakest of the root and fatness of the " olive-tree; boast not against the branches. But, " if thou boast, thou bearest not the root, but the " root thee. Thou wilt say then, The branches " were broken off, that I might be graffed in. " Well; because of unbelief they were broken off, " and thou standest by faith. Be not high-minded, " but fear. For, if God spared not the natural " branches, take heed lest he also spare not thee. " Behold therefore the goodness and severity of " God: on them which fell, severity; but toward " thee, goodness: if thou continue in his goodness; " otherwise thou also shalt be cut off. And they " also, if they abide not in unbelief, shall be graffed " in: for God is able to graff them in again. For, " if thou wert cut out of the olive-tree which is wild

" by

" by nature, and wert graffed contrary to nature into
" a good olive-tree; how much more shall these,
" which be the natural branches, be graffed into
" their own olive-tree? For I would not, brethren,
" that ye should be ignorant of this mystery, lest
" ye should be wise in your own conceits; that
" blindness in part is happened to Israel until the
" fulness of the Gentiles be come. And so all Is-
" rael shall be saved: as it is written, There shall
" come out of Sion the deliverer, and shall turn
" away ungodliness from Jacob—O the depth of
" the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of
" God! how unsearchable are his judgments, and
" his ways past finding out! For who hath known
" the mind of the Lord? or who hath been his
" counsellor? Or who hath first given to him, and
" it shall be recompensed unto him again? For of
" him, and through him, and to him, are all things:
" to whom be glory for ever. Amen *."

* Rom. xi. 17—26, 33—36.

APPENDIX.

APPENDIX.

No. I.

THE ASTRONOMICAL CANON OF PTOLEMY,

ARRANGED SYNCHRONICALLY WITH THE KINGS OF JUDAH AND ASSYRIA, THE HIGH PRIESTS OF JUDAH, THE GREEK KINGS OF SYRIA, AND THE PRINCES AND KINGS OF JUDEA.

Kings of Babylon.		A. Æ. N.	A. P. J.	A. A. C.	*Kings of Judah.*	*Kings of Assyria.*
Beginning of the kingdom of Babylon.		1	3967	747	12th year of Jotham.	Beginning of the kingdom of Assyria; 1st year of Tiglath-Pileser.
Nabonassar	14	14	3980	734	9th year of Ahaz.	14th year of Tiglath-Pileser.
Nadius	2	16	3982	732	11th year of Ahaz.	16th year of Tiglath-Pileser.
Chinzirus and Porus	5	21	3987	727	16th year of Ahaz, and 1st of Hezekiah.	2d year of Salmaneser.
Jugæus	5	26	3992	722	6th year of Hezekiah.	7th year of Salmaneser.
Mardoc Empadus	12	38	4004	710	18th year of Hezekiah.	5th year of Sennacherib.
Arkianus	5	43	4009	705	23d year of Hezekiah.	2d year of Esarhaddon.
Interregnum I.	2	45	4011	703	25th year of Hezekiah.	4th year of Esarhaddon.
Belibus	3	48	4014	700	28th year of Hezekiah.	7th year of Esarhaddon.
Aphronadius	6	54	4020	694	5th year of Manasseh.	13th year of Esarhaddon.
Rigebelus	1	55	4021	693	6th year of Manasseh.	14th year of Esarhaddon.
Mesessimordacus	4	59	4025	689	10th year of Manasseh.	18th year of Esarhaddon.
Interregnum II.	8	67	4033	681	18th year of Manasseh.	26th year of Esarhaddon.

Kings of Babylon and Assyria united.		A. Æ. N.	A. P. J.	A. A. C.	*Kings of Judah.*	*Kings of Assyria.*
Asaraddinus or Esar-haddon	13	80	4046	668	31st year of Manasseh.	39th year of Esar-haddon, as king of Assyria.
Saosduchinus	20	100	4066	648	51st year of Manasseh.	
Chiniladanus	22	122	4088	626	15th year of Josiah.	
Nabopollassar or Nebuchadnezzar the father	21	143	4109	605	5th year of Jehoiakim.	
Nabocolassar or Nebuchadnezzar the son	43	186	4152	562	37th year of Jehoichin's captivity. 2 Kings xxv. 27. Jerem. lii. 31.	
Elyarodamus or Evil-Merodach	2	188	4154	560	47th year of the captivity of Judah.	
Neriçassolassar	4	192	4158	556	51st year of the captivity of Judah.	
Nabonadius or Belshazzar	17	209	4175	539	68th year of the captivity of Judah.	
Kings of Persia.					*High-priests of Judah.*	*Greek kings of Syria.*
Cyrus	9	218	4184	530	7th year of Jeshua.	
Cambyses	8	226	4192	522	15th year of Jeshua.	
Darius Hystaspis	36	262	4228	486	51st year of Jeshua.	
Xerxes	21	283	4249	465	19th year of Joiakim.	
Artaxerxes Longimanus	41	324	4290	424	30th year of Eliashib	
Darius Nothus	19	343	4309	405	9th year of Joiada.	
Artaxerxes Mnemon	46	389	4355	359	15th year of Johanan.	
Ochus	21	410	4376	338	4th year of Jaddua.	
Arogus	2	412	4378	336	6th year of Jaddua	
Darius Codomannus	4	416	4382	332	10th year of Jaddua.	
Greek kings of Persia.						
Alexander	8	424	4390	324	18th year of Jaddua.	
Philip Aridèus	7	431	4397	317	5th year of Onias I.	
Alexander Egus	12	443	4409	305	17th year of Onias I.	8th year of Seleucus Nicator.

Greek kings of Egypt.		A. Æ. N.	A. P. J.	A. A. C.	*High-priests of Judah.*	*Greek kings of Syria.*
Ptolemy Soter	20	463	4429	285	7th year of Eleazar.	28th year of Seleucus Nicator.
Ptolemy Philadelphus	38	501	4467	247	4th year of Onias II.	14th year of Antiochus Theus.
Ptol. Euergetes I.	25	526	4492	222	29th year of Onias II.	1st year of Antiochus Magnus.
Ptol. Philopator	17	543	4509	205	13th year of Simon II.	18th year of Antiochus Magnus.
Ptol. Epiphanes	24	567	4533	181	15th year of Onias III.	6th year of Seleucus Philopator.
					Princes and kings of Judèa.	
Ptol. Philometor	35	602	4568	146	15th year of Jonathan.	5th year of Alexander Balus.
Ptol. Euergetes II.	29	631	4597	117	19th year of John Hyrcanus.	7th year of Antiochus Grypus.
Ptol. Soter	36	667	4633	81	25th year of Alexander Jannèus.	3d year of Tigranes.
Dionysius	29	696	4662	52	12th year of Hyrcanus.	
Cleopatra	22	718	4684	30	8th year of Herod.	
Roman Emperors.				A. Æ. C.		
Augustus	43	761	4727	14		
Tiberius	22	783	4749	36		
Caius	4	787	4753	40		
Claudius	14	801	4767	54		
Nero	14	815	4781	68		
Vespasian	10	825	4791	78		
Titus	3	828	4794	81		
Domitian	15	843	4809	96		
Nerva	1	844	4810	97		
Trajan	19	863	4829	116		
Hadrian	21	884	4850	137		
Antoninus	23	907	4873	160		

No. II.

SUCCESSION OF THE KINGS OF JUDAH, THE HIGH-PRIESTS OF JUDAH, AND THE PRINCES AND KINGS OF JUDEA, FROM THE COMMENCEMENT OF THE ERA OF NABONASSAR, ARRANGED SYNCHRONICALLY WITH THE KINGS OF BABYLON, ASSYRIA, PERSIA, EGYPT, SYRIA, AND THE ROMAN EMPERORS.

Kings of Judah.		A. Æ. N.	A. P J.	A.A.C.	*Kings of Babylon.*	*Kings of Assyria.*
		1	3967	747	1st year of Nabonassar.	1st year of Tiglath-Pileser.
Jotham	16	5	3971	743	5th year of Nabonassar.	5th year of Tiglath-Pileser.
Ahaz	15	20	3986	728	4th year of Chinzirus and Porus.	1st year of Salmaneser.
Hezekiah	29	49	4015	699	1st year of Aphronadius.	8th year of Esarhaddon.
					Kings of Babylon and Assyria united.	
Manasseh	55	104	4070	644	4th year of Chinila-danus.	
Ammon	3	107	4073	641	7th year of Chinila-danus.	
Josiah	31	138	4104	610	16th year of Nabo-polassar, or Nebuchadnezzar the father.	
Jehoiakim	11	149	4115	599	6th year of Nabo-colassar, or Nebuchadnezzar the son, according to Ptolemy and Daniel; 8th, according to Jeremiah.	
Zedekiah	11	160	4126	588	17th year of Nabo-colassar, or Nebuchadnezzar the son, according to Ptolemy and Daniel; 19th, according to Jeremiah.	

Kings of Judah.		A. Æ. N.	A. P. J.	A.A.C	*Kings of Persia.*	*Greek Kings of Syria.*
Interregnum, caused by the captivity subsequent to the destruction of the temple and city of Jerusalem.	51	211	4177	537	2d year of Darius, according to Scripture and Xenophon; 2d year of Cyrus, according to Ptolemy.	
High-priests of Judah.						
Jeshua or Joshua	53	264	4230	484	2d year of Xerxes.	
Joiakim	30	294	4260	454	11th year of Artaxerxes Longimanus.	
Eliashib	40	334	4300	414	10th year of Darius Nothus.	
Joiada	40	374	4340	374	31st year of Artaxerxes Mnemon.	
Johanan	32	406	4372	342	17th year of Ochus.	
					Greek Kings of Persia.	
Jaddua	20	426	4392	322	2d year of Philip Aridèus.	
					Greek Kings of Egypt.	
Onias I.	21	447	4413	301	4th year of Ptolemy Soter.	12th year of Seleucus.
Simon I. (the just)	9	456	4422	292	13th year of Ptol. Soter.	21st year of Seleucus.
Eleazar	15	471	4437	277	8th year of Ptol. Philadelphus.	3d year of Antiochus Soter.
Manasseh	26	497	4463	251	34th year of Ptol. Philadelphus.	10th year of Antiochus Theus.
Onias II.	33	530	4496	218	4th year of Ptol. Philopator.	5th year of Antiochus Magnus.
Simon II.	22	552	4518	196	9th year of Ptol. Epiphanes.	27th year of Antiochus Magnus.
Onias III.	20	572	4538	176	5th year of Ptol. Philometor.	11th year of Seleucus Philopator.
Jason	3	575	4541	173	8th year of Ptol. Philometor.	3d year of Antiochus Epiphanes.
Menelaus	5	580	4546	168	13th year of Ptol. Philometor.	8th year of Antiochus Epiphanes.
Persecution of the Jews	1	581	4547	167	14th year of Ptol. Philometer.	9th year of Antiochus Epiphanes.

Princes and Kings of Judea.		A. Æ. N.	A. P. J.	A. A. C.	*Greek Kings of Egypt.*	*Greek Kings of Syria.*
Judas Maccabèus	6	587	4553	161	20th year of Ptol. Philometor.	2d year of Demetrius Soter.
Jonathan	17	604	4570	144	2d year of Ptol. Euergetes II.	2d year of Demetrius Nicator.
Simon	8	612	4578	136	10th year of Ptol. Euerg. II.	5th year of Antiochus Sidetes,
John Hyrcanus	29	641	4607	107	10th year of Ptol. Soter.	17th year of Antiochus Grypus.
Aristobulus	1	642	4608	106	11th year of Ptol. Soter,	18th year of Antiochus Grypus.
Alexander Jannèus	27	669	4635	79	2d year of Dionysius, according to Ptolemy, or 2d of Alexander.	5th year of Tigranes.
Alexandra	9	678	4644	70	11th year of Dionysius, according to Ptolemy; or 11th of Alexander.	14th year of Tigranes.
Aristobulus	6	684	4650	64	17th year of Dionysius, according to Ptolemy; or 2d of Ptol. Auletes.	
Hyrcanus	23	707	4673	41	11th year of Cleopatra.	
Antigonus	3	710	4676	38	14th year of Cleopatra.	
					Roman Emperors.	
Herod	34	744	4710	4	27th year of Augustus.	
				A. Æ. C.		
Archelaus	10	754	4720	7	37th year of Augustus.	
		759	4725	12	42d year of Augustus; 1st of Tiberius jointly.	
		762	4728	15	1st year of Tiberius alone.	
		773	4739	26	15th year of Tiberius jointly; 12th year alone.	

FINIS.

Printed by Law and Gilbert, St. John's-square, London.

Lately published, by the same Author,

1. A DISSERTATION on the PROPHECIES, that have been fulfilled, are now fulfilling, or will hereafter be fulfilled, relative to the great Period of 1260 Years; the Papal and Mohammedan Apostasies, the Tyrannical Reign of Antichrist, or the Infidel Power, and the Restoration of the Jews.

The fourth edition, in two large volumes octavo, price in boards 1l. 1s.

2. A GENERAL and CONNECTED VIEW of the PROPHECIES, relative to the Conversion, Restoration, Union, and Future Glory, of the Houses of Judah and Israel; the Progress and final Overthrow of the Antichristian Confederacy in the Land of Palestine; and the ultimate general Diffusion of Christianity.

The second edition, in two volumes octavo, price in boards 17s.

N.B. The above, with the Dissertation on the Prophecy of the Seventy Weeks, completes the Author's Plan of Dissertations on the Prophecies, which reach to, or beyond, the great Period of 1260 Years.

3. A DISSERTATION on the MYSTERIES of the CABIRI; or the Great Gods of Phenicia, Samothrace, Egypt, Troas, Greece, Italy, and Crete; being an Attempt to deduce the several Orgies of Isis, Ceres, Mithras, Bacchus, Rhea, Adonis, and Hecate, from an Union of the Rites commemorative of the Deluge with the Adoration of the Hosts of Heaven.

In two large volumes octavo, price in boards 16s.

SERMONS AND OTHER THEOLOGICAL WORKS,

Printed for, and sold by F. C. and J. RIVINGTON, No. 62, St. Paul's Church-yard.

AGUTTER. Sermons on various Occasions. By the Rev. W. AGUTTER, A.M. Chaplain to the Asylum for Female Orphans. 8vo. 9s.

APTHORP. Discourses on Prophecy, read in Lincoln's Inn Chapel at Warburton's Lecture, by EAST APTHORP, D.D. late Rector of St. Mary Le Bow. 2 vols. 8vo. 10s.

BANDINEL. Eight Sermons, preached at the Bampton Lecture in 1780, by JAMES BANDINEL, D.D. of Jesus College. Second edition. 8vo. 6s.

BARROW. Eight Sermons, containing Answers to some popular Objections against the Christian Revelation, preached at the Bampton Lecture in 1799. By WILLIAM BARROW, LL.D. and F.S.A. of Queen's College. 8vo. 7s.

BENSON. Sermons on various Subjects, Moral and Theological, by MARTIN BENSON, A.M. Minister of Tunbridge Wells Chapel. 8vo. 6s

BERKELEY. Sermons, by the late GEORGE BERKELEY, LL.D. Prebendary of Canterbury. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

BISHOP. Sermons, chiefly on practical Subjects, by the Rev. SAM. BISHOP, A.M. late Head Master of Merchant Taylors School. 8vo. 6s.

BRACKENBURY. Fifty-three Discourses, containing a connected System of Doctrinal and Practical Christianity; for Families and Country Congregations. By the Rev. EDWARD BRACKENBURY, A.B. Vicar of Skindleby, in the County of Lincoln. 2 vols. 8vo. 15s.

BREWSTER. Lectures on the Acts of the Apostles, delivered in the Parish Church of Stockton-upon-Tees, during Lent, in the Years 1803, 1804, 1805, and 1806; with three Maps of the Travels of the Holy Apostles. By JOHN BREWSTER, M.A. Rector of Boldon, &c. Durham. 2 vols. 8vo. 14s.

BURNABY. Occasional Sermons and Charges, by the Rev. ANDREW BURNABY, D.D. Archdeacon of Leicester, and Vicar of Greenwich. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

CARR. Sermons, by the late Rev. GEORGE CARR, Senior Clergyman of the English Episcopal Congregation in Edinburgh. 2 vols. 12mo. 7s.

CLARKE. Forty Sermons on Doctrinal and Practical Subjects, selected from the Works of the Rev. Dr. SAMUEL CLARKE, for the Use of Families. By the Rev. SAMUEL CLAPHAM, M.A. Chaplain to EARL CAMDEN. 8vo. 9s.

CLARKE. Sermons on the Character and professional Duties of Seamen, preached on board H.M.S. Impetueux, by JAMES STANIER CLARKE, F.R.S. Domestic Chaplain to H.R.H. the Prince of Wales. 8vo. 5s.

CLEAVER,

Cleaver. Eleven Sermons on Select Subjects, by William, Lord Bishop of St. Asaph: also four Sermons of the late William Cleaver, M. A. of Lincoln College. 8vo. 9s.

Cleeve. Select Sermons, dedicated to the Queen, by the Rev. Alex. Cleeve, A.B. late Vicar of Wooller, in Northumberland. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

Clements. Eight Sermons, preached (at Lady Moyer's Lecture) in St. Paul's Cathedral in 1757, by William Clements, A.M. late Librarian at Sion College. 8vo. 4s.

Cowe. Twelve Sermons on the Advantages which result from Christianity, &c. for the Use of Families; to which are added, Philanthropic Tracts. By James Cowe, M. A. Vicar of Sunbury. Second edition. 8vo. 6s.

Daubeny. Eight Discourses on the Connection between the Old and New Testament, considered as two Parts of the same Divine Revelation, &c. &c. by the Rev. Charles Daubeny, Archdeacon of Sarum. 8vo. 9s.

—— Discourses on various Subjects and Occasions, by the same Author. Vol. II. 8vo. 8s.

Delany's Sixteen Discourses upon Christian Doctrine and Duties. 8vo. 5s.

Drummond. Sermons on public Occasions, and a Letter on Theological Study, by Robert, late Archbishop of York; with Memoirs of his Life, by G. H. Drummond, A. M. Prebendary of York. 8vo. 6s.

Farquhar. Sermons on various Subjects, by the late John Farquhar, M. A. Minister at Nigg. Fourth edition. 8vo. 6s.

Farrer. Sermons on the Parables, a new edition; the whole Series recomposed, and contained in one volume. By John Farrer, M. A. Rector of the United Parishes of St. Clement, Eastcheap, and St. Martin Orgars. 8vo. 9s.

—— Sermons on the Mission and Character of Christ, and the Beatitudes; preached at the Bampton Lecture in 1803, by the same Author. 8vo. 7s.

Gardiner. Sermons on various Subjects, preached at the Octagon Chapel, Bath, by the Rev. John Gardiner, D.D. Rector of Brailsford, and Vicar of Shirley, in the County of Devon. Second edition. 8vo. 8s.

Gilson. Sermons on practical Subjects, by the Rev. D. Gilson, M.A. late Curate of St. Saviour's, Southwark. 2 vols. 8vo. 16s.

Gleig. Sermons, preached occasionally at the Episcopal Chapel, Stirling, during the eventful Period, from 1793 to 1803, by the Right Rev. Bishop Gleig. 8vo. 7s.

Goddard. Sermons, preached before the University of Cambridge, by P. S. Goddard, D.D. late Master of Clare Hall. 8vo. 5s.

Gordon. Sermons on several Subjects and Occasions, particularly on the Festivals and Fasts of the Church of England, by the Rev. Sir A. Gordon, Bart. M.A. Rector of West Tilbury, Essex. 8vo. 8s.

Graves.

GRAVES. Sermons on the Clerical Character, on Miracles, &c. &c. by the late Rev. RICHARD GRAVES, M.A. Rector of Claverton, Somerset. 8vo. 5s.

GRAY. Discourses on various Subjects, illustrative of the Evidence, Influence, and Doctrines of Christianity, by the Rev. ROBERT GRAY, D.D. Prebendary of Durham. 8vo. 6s.

—— Sermons on the Principles upon which the Reformation of the Church of England was established, preached at the Bampton Lecture in 1796; by the same Author. 8vo. 6s.

HAGGITT. Sermons to Country Congregations, by the late Rev. GEORGE HAGGITT, A.M. Rector of Beechamwell, Norfolk. Sixth edition. 2 vols. 8vo. 14s.

HERVEY. Sermons, Tracts, and Letters, by JAMES HERVEY, A.M. late Rector of Weston Favell, Northamptonshire. 4 vols. 8vo. 1l. 4s.

HEWLETT. Sermons on different Subjects, by the Rev. JOHN HEWLETT, B.D. Morning Preacher at the Foundling Hospital. 3 vols. 8vo. 1l. 5s.

HEYLYN. Select Discourses on the principal Points of natural and revealed Religion; also, Theological Lectures on the ten first Chapters of St. Matthew. By JOHN HEYLYN, D.D. late Prebendary of Westminster. 2 vols. 8vo. 12s.

HORNE. Sermons, and other Works of GEORGE HORNE, D.D. late Lord Bishop of Norwich; handsomely printed in 6 vols. 8vo. 3l. 3s.

HORSLEY. Sermons, by SAMUEL HORSLEY, LL.D. F.R.S. F.A.S. late Lord Bishop of St. Asaph. 2 vols. 8vo. 1l. 1s.

INNES. Fourteen Discourses on practical Subjects, by the Rev. G. INNES, of Aberdeen. 12mo. 3s.

JONES. Sermons, and other Works, Theological and Miscellaneous, of the late WILLIAM JONES, M.A. F.R.S. Rector of Paston, Northamptonshire, and Minister of Nayland, in Suffolk. A new edition, in 6 vols. 8vo. 3l. 3s.

—— Four Discourses; 1. On the Religious Use of Botanical Philosophy. 2. Considerations on the Nature and Economy of Beasts and Cattle. 3. On the Natural History of the Earth and its Minerals. 4. On the Natural Evidences of Christianity, preached on Mr. Fairchild's Foundation, in 1784, 5, 6, and 7; by the same Author. 12mo. 2s. 6d.

JORTIN. Sermons on different Subjects; to which are added, the Doctrine of a Future State, as it may be collected from the Old Testament; and four Charges to the Clergy of the Archdeaconry of London. By the late Rev. JOHN JORTIN, D.D. Archdeacon of London, &c. A new edition. 4 vols. 8vo. 1l. 16s.

—— Discourses concerning the Truth of the Christian Religion, and Remarks on Ecclesiastical History. By the same Author. A new edition. 3 vols. 8vo. 1l. 4s.

KEELING's (Rev. Barth.) Eight Discourses. 8vo. 4s.

KETT.

KETT. Eight Sermons, containing a Repreſentation of the Conduct and Opinions of the primitive Chriſtians, with Remarks on certain Aſſertions of Mr. Gibbon and Dr. Prieſtley; preached at the Bampton Lecture in 1790, by HENRY KETT, M.A. Fellow of Trinity College. Second edition. 8vo. 7s.

LAYARD. Sermons, by CHARLES PETER LAYARD, D.D. F.R.S. F.A.S. late Dean of Briſtol. Second edition. 8vo. 12s. or on royal paper 1l. 1s.

LEIGHTON'S (Abp.) Eighteen Sermons. 8vo. 5s.

LOGAN. Sermons, by the late Rev. JOHN LOGAN, F.R.S. Edinb. one of the Miniſters at Leith. Fifth edition. 2 vols. 8vo. 15s.

MACDONALD. Twenty-nine miſcellaneous Sermons, by A. MACDONALD, late Miniſter of the Engliſh Church at Glaſgow. 8vo. 5s.

MILNE. Sermons, delivered in St. Andrew's Chapel, Banff, by the Rev. JAMES MILNE, A.M. Miniſter of that Chapel. 8vo. 7s. 6d.

MORGAN. Sermons on ſeveral Subjects, by JOHN PILKINGTON MORGAN, M.A. late Vicar of Hitchin, Herts. 2 vols. crown 8vo. 9s.

MORTON. Sermons on various intereſting Subjects, by the Rev. JOSHUA MORTON, Vicar of Riſely, in the County of Bedford. 8vo. 7s.

NANCE. Sermons on various Subjects and Occaſions, by the Rev. JOHN NANCE, M.A. Fellow of Worceſter College, Oxford. 8vo. 6s.

NARES. Diſcourſes before the Hon. Society of Lincoln's Inn, by the Rev. ROBERT NARES, A.M. F.R.S. F.A.S. Archdeacon of Stafford, &c. 8vo. 7s.

—— A connected and chronological View of the Prophecies relating to the Chriſtian Church; in twelve Sermons, preached in Lincoln's Inn Chapel, from 1800 to 1804, at Bp. Warburton's Lecture, by the ſame Author. 8vo. 7s. 6d.

NARES. Sermons, compoſed for Country Congregations, by the Rev. EDWARD NARES, A.M. Rector of Biddenden, Kent. 8vo. 7s.

NEVE. Seventeen Sermons, compoſed for a Country Congregation, by the Rev. TIMOTHY NEVE, D.D. late Lady Margaret's Profeſſor of Divinity in the Univerſity of Oxford. 8vo. 6s.

O'BEIRNE. Sermons on ſeveral Occaſions; to which are added three Charges, and a circular Addreſs to the Clergy of the Dioceſe of Oſſory, on the State of Ireland in 1787; by T. L. O'BEIRNE, D.D. Lord Biſhop of Meath. 8vo. 6s.

OWEN. The Intent and Propriety of the Scripture Miracles conſidered and explained, in a Series of Sermons, for the Hon. R. Boyle's Lecture in 1769, 70, and 71, by the Rev. Dr. HENRY OWEN, late Rector of St. Olave, Hart-Street. 2 vols. 8vo. 10s.

PARTRIDGE. Sermons, altered and adapted to the Engliſh Pulpit, from French Writers, by the Rev. SAMUEL PARTRIDGE, M.A. F.S.A. Vicar of Boſton. 2 vols. 8vo. 15s.

N. B. The volumes are ſold ſeparately.

PLUMTRE.

Plumptre. The Chriſtian Guide, or an Attempt to explain, in a Series of connected Diſcourſes, the leading Articles of Chriſtianity; for the Uſe of Families and young Perſons. By Charles Plumptre, M. A. Rector of Long Newton, in the County of Durham. 8vo. 7s.

Plumptre. Four Diſcourſes on Subjects relating to the Amuſement of the Stage; preached at Great St. Mary's Church, Cambridge; with copious Notes. By James Plumptre, B. D. Fellow of Clare Hall. 8vo. 7s.

Pott. Three Sermons for the Feſtivals and Faſts of the Church of England, with a Diſcourſe on the Lord's Day, or Chriſtian Sabbath. By Joseph Holden Pott, M. A. Prebendary of Lincoln, and Archdeacon of St. Alban's. 12mo. 2s.

—— Elementary Diſcourſes, deſigned for the Uſe of a young Perſon after Confirmation; with Devotions, ſelected chiefly from the Book of Common Prayer. By the ſame Author. 12mo. 2s.

Ramsay's (Rev. J.) Sea Sermons, or a Series of Diſcourſes for the Uſe of the Royal Navy. 8vo. 4s.

Randolph. Sermons, preached at Laura Chapel, Bath, during the Seaſon of Advent in 1799. By the Rev. F. Randolph, D.D. Prebendary of Briſtol. 8vo. 6s.

Rennell. Sermons, on various Subjects, by Thomas Rennell, D. D. Dean of Wincheſter, and Maſter of the Temple. 8vo. 7s.

Riddoch. Sermons, on ſeveral Subjects and Occaſions. By the late James Riddoch, A. M. one of the Miniſters of St. Paul's Church, Aberdeen. Third edition. 3 vols. 8vo. 1l. 1s.

Robertson. Sermons on the practical Obligations of a Chriſtian Life; for the Uſe of Families. By the Rev. Theodore Robertson, LL. B. 2 vols. 8vo. 14s.

Scattergood. Fifty-two Sermons upon ſeveral Occaſions. By Samuel Scattergood. A new edition. 2 vols. 8vo. 1l. 4s.

Secker. Sermons, on various Subjects, by Thomas Secker, LL.D. late Lord Archbiſhop of Canterbury. 4 vols. 8vo. 1l.

Southgate. Sermons, preached to Parochial Congregations, by the late Rev. Richard Southgate, B. A. with a Biographical Preface, by George Gaskin, D.D. 2 vols. 8vo. 14s.

Stebbing. Sermons on practical Subjects, by the late Rev. Henry Stebbing, D.D. Preacher to the Hon. Society of Gray's Inn. 3 vols. 8vo. 18s.

N. B. The third volume may be had ſeparate. 6s.

Sterne's (Rev. Lawrence) Sermons. 6 vols. foolſc. 8vo. 15s.

Stephenson. The Romiſh Church; or, an Hiſtorical and Critical View of ſome of the leading Doctrines of the Church of Rome, in a Series of Diſcourſes, preached at Biſhop's Wearmouth, in 1806; being, partly, a Compilation from Secker, and others, with Notes. By the Rev. George Stephenson, M. A. Vicar of Kelloe, and Curate of Biſhop's Wearmouth, Durham. 8vo. 8s.

Stevens,

STEVENS. Sermons, by the late WILLIAM STEVENS, D. D. Rector of Great Snoring Norfolk, and Lecturer of St. George's, Hanover Square. 3 vols. 8vo. 1l. 1s.

THOMAS. Sermons and Charges of the Right Rev. JOHN THOMAS, LL. D. late Lord Biſhop of Rocheſter; with a Life of the Author, by G. A. THOMAS, A. M. Rector of Wickham, Hants. 2 vols. 8vo. 14s.

TOWNSON. The Works of the Rev. THOMAS TOWNSON, D. D. late Archdeacon of Richmond, &c. conſiſting of Diſcourſes on the Goſpels, and on the Evangelical Hiſtory, &c. &c. to which is prefixed, an Account of the Author, by RALPH CHURTON, M. A. Archdeacon of St. David's, &c. &c. A new edition, with two plates. 2 vols. 8vo. 18s.

TUCKER. Seventeen Sermons on ſome of the moſt important Points on Natural and Revealed Religion, reſpecting the Happineſs both of the preſent and of a future Life. By JOSIAH TUCKER, D. D. late Dean of Gloceſter. 8vo. 5s.

VAN MILDERT. An Hiſtorical View of the Riſe and Progreſs of Infidelity, with a Refutation of its Principles and Reaſonings; in a Series of Sermons, preached for the Hon. R. Boyle's Lecture, from 1802 to 1805. By the Rev. WILLIAM VAN MILDERT, M. A. Rector of St. Mary-le-Bow. Second edition, with the Appendix conſiderably enlarged. 2 vols. 8vo. 1l.

N. B. The Appendix may be had ſeparate, to complete the firſt edition, 4s.

WALKER. Sermons, on practical Subjects, by ROBERT WALKER, late one of the Miniſters of the High Church of Edinburgh; with a Character of the Author, by HUGH BLAIR, D. D. A new edition. 4 vols. 8vo. 1l. 4s.

WELLS. Diſcourſes, &c. on ſeveral Subjects, by the late CHRISTOPHER WELLS, B. D. Rector of Remenham, Berks. 2 vols. 8vo. 16s.

WHITAKER. Family Sermons, by the Rev. E. W. WHITAKER, Rector of St. Mildred's and All Saints, Canterbury. Second edition. 3 vols. 8vo. 1l. 1s.

—— Eight Sermons on Education, by the ſame Author. 8vo. 4s.

WHITAKER. Six Diſcourſes on 2 Theſſ. ii. 11. wherein the Divine Conduct is traced, from the Time of Adam to the preſent Diſpenſation of Grace we live under, &c. By the late J. WHITAKER, M. A. Vicar of Penbury, in Kent. 8vo. 5s.

WILSON. Thirty-three Sermons, ſelected from the Works of the Right Rev. THOMAS WILSON, D. D. late Biſhop of Sodor and Man. 2 vols. 12mo. 6s.

WILSON. Sermons on ſeveral Subjects, by the Rev. H. B. WILSON, M. A. one of the Maſters of Merchant Taylors School. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

WOOLLCOMBE. Sermons, on various Subjects, by the Rev. WILLIAM WOOLLCOMBE, M. A. late Prebendary of Exeter. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

THEOLOGICAL WORKS,

Printed for, and sold by F. C. and J. Rivington.

Abbadie. The Accomplishment of Prophecy, in the Character and Conduct of Jesus Christ. By James Abbadie, D. D. formerly Dean of Killaloe. 12mo. 4s.

Addison. The Evidences of the Christian Religion, by the Right Hon. Joseph Addison. With the Notes of the learned Gabriel Seigneux de Correvon; translated into English, by the Rev. Richard Purdy, D. D. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

Bell. An Enquiry into the Divine Missions of John the Baptist, and Jesus Christ. By William Bell, D. D. Prebendary of St. Peter's, Westminster. 8vo. New edition. 10s. 6d.

Brewster. Meditations for the Aged: by John Brewster, M. A. Rector of Boldon, &c. Durham. 8vo. 9s. 6d.

—— Meditations of a Recluse, chiefly on religious subjects. By the same Author. 8vo. Third edition. 8s.

Churchman's Remembrancer. Being a Collection of scarce and valuable Tracts in defence of the Doctrine and Discipline of the Church of England, Vol. I. containing Five Numbers. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

Clarke. A Paraphrase on the four Evangelists, with Critical Notes on the more difficult Passages. By Samuel Clarke, D. D. late Rector of St. James's, Westminster. 1 vol. 8vo. 8s.

Cruttwell. A Concordance of Parallels, collected from Bibles and Commentaries, in various languages, with the authorities to each; by the late Rev. C. Cruttwell. 4to. 1l. 1s.

Daubeny. A Guide to the Church, in several Discourses. By the Rev. Charles Daubeny, Archdeacon of Sarum. 2 vols. 8vo. Second edition. 17s.

—— Vindiciæ Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ; an Answer to Mr. Overton's "True Churchmen ascertained." By the same Author. 8vo. 8s.

Ecclesiastical and University Annual Register, for the year 1809. 8vo. 15s.

The same for the year 1808. 8vo. 15s.

Faber. A Dissertation on the Prophecies, that have been fulfilled, are now fulfilling, or will hereafter be fulfilled, relative to the great Period of 1260 years, &c. &c. By the Rev. George Stanley Faber, B. D. Rector of Redmarshall, Durham. Fourth edition. 2 vols. 8vo. 1l. 1s.

—— A General and connected view of the Prophecies, relative to the Conversion, Restoration, Union, and Future Glory, of the Houses of Judah and Israel, &c. &c. By the same Author. Second edition. 2 vols. 8vo. 17s.

—— A Dissertation on the Mysteries of the Cabiri. By the same Author. 2 vols. 8vo. 16s.

Gray. A Key to the Old Testament and Apocrypha. By the Rev. Robert Gray, D. D. Prebendary of Durham. Fifth edition, 8vo. 9s.

Hare.

HARE. A Treatiſe on the Conduct of God to the Human Species, and on the Divine Miſſion of Jeſus Chriſt. By the late Rev. J. HARE, A. M. Rector of Coln St. Denys, Glouceſterſhire, and Vicar of Stratton St. Margaret, Wilts. Second edition. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

—— An Eſſay on the neceſſity of Revealed Religion. By the ſame Author. 12mo. Third edition. 2s. 6d.

—— An Eſſay on the Unreaſonableneſs of Scepticiſm. By the ſame Author. Handſomely printed. 12mo. 6s.

HOOKER. An Analyſis of Hooker's Eight Books of Eccleſiaſtical Polity. By the Rev. J. COLLINSON, M. A. Rector of Gateſhead, Durham. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

HORNE. Eſſays and Thoughts on various ſubjects: with Nine Papers from the Olla Podrida, and Poems. By the Right Rev. GEORGE HORNE, D. D. late Lord Biſhop of Norwich. 12mo. 5s.

KETT. Hiſtory the Interpreter of Prophecy; or a View of the Scriptural Prophecies and their Accompliſhment in the paſt and preſent Occurrences of the World; with Conjectures reſpecting their future completion. By the Rev. HENRY KETT, M. A. Fifth edition, with additional notes. 2 vols. 8vo. 14s.

LE MESURIER. The Doctrine of the Euchariſt conſidered, as maintained by the Church of Rome and the Church of England reſpectively. By the Rev. THOMAS LE MESURIER, M. A. Rector of Newnton Longville, Bucks. 8vo. 7s. 6d.

MICHÆLIS. An Introduction to the New Teſtament, by J. D. MICHÆLIS; tranſlated from the German by HERBERT MARSH, D. D. F. R. S. Margaret Profeſſor of Divinity at Cambridge. 6 vols. 8vo. 2l. 8s. or on Royal Paper 3l. 3s.

REVIVAL of the Roman and Greek Empires: being Obſervations on Daniel's Metallick Image. 2 vols. 8vo. 14s.

SCHOLAR ARMED (The) againſt the Errors of the Time; or a Collection of Tracts on the Principles and Evidences of Chriſtianity. Second edition. 2 vols. 8vo. 16s.

TRIMMER. A Help to the Unlearned in the Study of the Holy Scriptures: being an attempt to explain the Bible in a familiar way, adapted to common apprehenſions. By Mrs. TRIMMER. Second edition. 8vo. 12s.

WILSON. Letters on the Truth, and certainty of Natural and Revealed Religion, intended as an Introduction to Biſhop Butler's Analogy of Religion, Natural and Revealed. By the Rev. JOSEPH WILSON, A. B. 12mo. 4s. 6d.

WIX. Scriptural Illuſtrations of the 39 Articles of the Church of England. By SAMUEL WIX, A. M. Vicar of St. Bartholomew the Leſs. 8vo. 8s.

WORDSWORTH. Eccleſiaſtical Biography: or Lives of eminent Men, connected with the Hiſtory of Religion in England; from the commencement of the Reformation to the Revolution; ſelected and illuſtrated with Notes. By CHRISTOPHER WORDSWORTH, M. A. Dean and Rector of Bocking. 6 vols. 8vo. 3l. 15s.

LATELY PUBLISHED,

By F. C. and J. RIVINGTON,

No. 62, ST. PAUL'S CHURCH-YARD.

VISCOUNT VALENTIA'S TRAVELS, Octavo Edition. Voyages and Travels to India, Ceylon, the Red Sea, Abyſſinia, and Egypt, in the Years 1803, 1804, 1805, and 1806. By GEORGE, VISCOUNT VALENTIA, 3 vols. 8vo. and a fourth in 4to. containing *all the Plates given in the 4to Edition.* 4l. 10s. A few copies remain of the 4to Edition, price 9l. 9s. bds.

MISS MITFORD'S NEW POEM. Chriſtina, the Maid of the South Seas, a Poem. By MARY RUSSELL MITFORD. Elegantly printed in 1 Vol. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

CLAPHAM. Sermons, ſelected and abridged, chiefly from Minor Authors, adapted to the Saints Days, Feſtivals, Faſts, &c. and to general Occaſions, &c. &c. For the Uſe of Families. Volume 3d. By the Rev. SAMUEL CLAPHAM, A. M. Vicar of Chriſt Church, Hants, &c. &c. 8vo. 13s.

PENNINGTON. Redemption; or a View of the Riſe and Progreſs of the Chriſtian Religion, from the Fall of Adam, to its complete Eſtabliſhment, under Conſtantine. By the Rev. MONTAGUE PENNINGTON, M. A. Vicar of Northbourn, Kent. 8vo. 7s. 6d.

PLUMPTRE. Letters to John Aikin, M. D. on his Volume of Vocal Poetry: and on his Eſſays on Song-Writing. To which are added, a Collection of Songs, reviſed and altered by the Editor; with ſome original Songs. By JAMES PLUMPTRE, B. D. Fellow of Clare-Hall, Cambridge. Elegantly printed in one large Volume. 12mo. 9s.

THE TRIUMPHS of RELIGION, a ſacred Poem; in four Parts. Foolscap, 8vo. 7s.

FABER. A Diſſertation on the Prophecy contained in Daniel, Chap. ix. Ver. 24 to 27, uſually denominated the Prophecy of the Seventy Weeks. By the Rev. G. S. FABER, B. D. Rector of Redmarſhall, Durham. 8vo. 12s.

HALES. A new Analyſis of Chronology; in which an attempt is made to explain the Hiſtory and Antiquities of the Nations recorded in the Scriptures, together with the Prophecies relating to them, on Principles tending to remove the Imperfection and Diſcordance of preceding Syſtems of Chronology. By WILLIAM HALES, D. D. Rector of Killeſandra, and formerly Fellow of Trinity College, and Profeſſor of Oriental Languages, in the Univerſity of Dublin. Volume 1st. 4to. illuſtrated with ſix Copper-plates. 2l. 2s.

* The 2d Volume will ſpeedily appear.

THE ECCLESIASTICAL AND UNIVERSITY ANNUAL REGISTER, for the Year 1810. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

THE POETICAL REGISTER, and Repoſitory of Fugitive Poetry, for the Years 1806 and 1807; containing Original Poetry, Fugitive Poetry, and Critical Characters of One Hundred and Sixty Poetic and Dramatic Works, publiſhed in the courſe of the two Years. 8vo. 12s.

* Another Volume, for the Years 1808 and 1809, is in the Preſs, and will be ſpeedily publiſhed.

BISHOP TAYLOR. Prayers, collected from the ſeveral Writings of Jeremy Taylor, Biſhop of Down and Connor, adapted to the Family, the Cloſet, the Sacrament, &c. &c. By the Rev. SAMUEL CLAPHAM, M. A. Vicar of Chriſt Church, Hants. 8vo 9s.

THE ANNUAL REGISTER; or, a View of the Hiſtory, Politics, and Literature, for the Year 1795. In one large Volume, 8vo. 18s.

*** In this Volume, beſide other intereſting Matter, will be found a more complete Account than has hitherto been given in the Engliſh Language, of the Poliſh Hiſtory, from the Period of the Ruſſian Invaſion, in 1792, to the Extinction of Poland, as an Independent State, in the Year 1795.

*** The Volumes, for the Years 1796 and 1804, are in the Preſs, and will ſpeedily appear.

HARPUR. An Eſſay on the Principles of Philoſophical Criticiſm, applied to Poetry. By JOSEPH HARPUR, L.L.D. of Trinity College, Oxford. 4to. 1l. 1s.

PENNINGTON. Continental Excurſions; or Tours into France, Switzerland, and Germany, in 1782, 1787, 1789. By the Rev. THOMAS PENNINGTON, M. A. Rector of Thorley, Herts. 2 vols. 8vo. 15s.

DE LUC. An Elementary Treatiſe on Geology: determining fundamental Points in that Science. By J. A. De Luc, F. R. S. 8vo. 12s.

DE LUC. Geological Travels. By J. A. De Luc, F. R. S. Vol. I. Containing, Travels in the North of Europe, with Obſervations on ſome Parts of the Coaſts of the Baltic, and the North Sea. 8vo. Price 12s.

N. B. The ſecond and third Volumes, containing Travels in England, will ſpeedily appear.

STABBACK. The Four Goſpels, and Acts of the Apoſtles, illuſtrated by Maps, and a Genealogical Table of the Family of Herod; with Annotations, Critical, Explanatory, and Practical, chiefly ſelected from the moſt able Commentators, and accompanied with Reflections. By THOMAS STABBACK, A. B. late of Oriel College, Oxford; Vicar of Cubert, and Lecturer of Helſton, in the County of Cornwall. 2 vols. 8vo. 1l. 1s.

DONOVAN'S
ILLUSTRATIONS
OF
BRITISH NATURAL HISTORY,
WITH COLOURED PLATES.

BRITISH INSECTS. The Natural Hiſtory of Britiſh Inſects; explaining them in their ſeveral States, with the Periods of their Transformations, their Food, Economy, &c. together with the Hiſtory of ſuch minute Inſects as require Inveſtigation by the Microſcope. The whole illuſtrated by elegantly *coloured Figures*, deſigned and executed from living Specimens. By E. DONOVAN, F. L. S. 15 Vols. Royal 8vo. 23l. 5s.

*** For the Accommodation of Purchaſers, this Work may be had, in ſingle Volumes, at 1l. 11s. each.

BRITISH BIRDS. The Natural Hiſtory of Britiſh Birds; or a Selection of the moſt rare, beautiful, and intereſting Birds which inhabit this Country: the Deſcriptions from the Syſtema Naturæ of Linnæus; with general Obſervations, either original, or collected from the lateſt and moſt eſteemed Engliſh Ornithologiſts; and embelliſhed with 124 Figures, drawn, engraved, and elegantly coloured from the original Specimens. By the ſame. 5 Vols. Royal 8vo. 9l.

*** The Volumes may be purchaſed ſingly at 1l. 16s. each.

BRITISH FISHES. The Natural Hiſtory of Britiſh Fiſhes, including ſcientific and general Deſcriptions of the moſt intereſting Species, and an extenſive Selection of accurately finiſhed coloured Plates: taken entirely from original Drawings, purpoſely made from the Specimens in a recent State, and for the moſt part whilſt living. By the ſame. 5 Vols. Royal 8vo, 7l. 15s. or any Volume ſeparate at 1l. 11s.

BRITISH SHELLS. The Natural Hiſtory of Britiſh Shells, including Figures and Deſcriptions of all the Species hitherto diſcovered in Great Britain, ſyſtematically arranged in the Linnæan Manner, with ſcientific and general Obſervations on each. The Plates elegantly coloured. By the ſame. 5 Vols. Royal 8vo. 7l. 15s. or any Volume ſingly at 1l. 11s.

ALSO,

INSTRUCTIONS FOR COLLECTING AND PRESERVING various Subjects of Natural Hiſtory; as Quadrupeds, Birds, Reptiles, Fiſhes, Shells, Corals, Plants, &c. with a Treatiſe on the Management of Inſects in their ſeveral States; ſelected from the beſt Authorities. By the ſame. 8vo. Second Edition. 4s. 6d.

Donovan's Illuſtrations of Foreign Natural Hiſtory, with coloured Plates.

CHINESE INSECTS. An Epitome of the Natural Hiſtory of the Inſects of China: compriſing Figures and Deſcriptions of upwards of 100 new, ſingular, and beautiful Species; together with ſome that are of Importance in Medicine, Domeſtic Economy, &c. The Figures are accurately drawn, engraved, and elegantly coloured, from Specimens of the Inſects: The Deſcriptions are arranged according to the Syſtem of Linnæus; with References to the Writings of Fabricius, and other ſyſtematic Authors. By E. DONOVAN, F.L.S. Elegantly printed in one Volume Royal 4to. 6l. 6s.

INSECTS OF INDIA. An Epitome of the Natural Hiſtory of the Inſects of India, and the Iſlands in the Indian Seas: compriſing upwards of 250 Figures and Deſcriptions of the moſt ſingular and beautiful Species, ſelected chiefly from thoſe recently diſcovered, and which have not appeared in the Works of any preceding Author. The Plates are elegantly coloured, and the Deſcriptions after the Linnæan and Fabrician Manner. By the ſame. Royal 4to. 6l. 6s.

INSECTS OF NEW HOLLAND, &c. An Epitome of the Inſects of New Holland, New Zealand, New Guinea, Otaheite, and other Iſlands in the Indian, Southern, and Pacific Oceans: including the Figures and Deſcriptions of 153 Species of the more ſplendid, beautiful and intereſting Inſects, hitherto diſcovered in thoſe Countries, and which for the moſt Part have not appeared in the Works of any preceding Author. The Plates are elegantly coloured, and the Deſcriptions after the Linnæan and Fabrician Manner. By the ſame. Royal 4to. 6l. 6s.

ALSO,

DESCRIPTIVE EXCURSIONS THROUGH SOUTH WALES, and MONMOUTHSHIRE, in the Year 1804, and the four preceding Summers. Embelliſhed with 31 Plates of Views, Antiquities, &c. By the ſame. 2 Vols. 8vo. 2l. 2s. Boards.

*** A ſelect Number of Copies have the Plates worked off in Colours, and finely tinted in Imitation of the original Drawings, Price in Boards 3l. 10s.

PRINTED FOR AND SOLD BY F. C. AND J. RIVINGTON,
NO. 62, ST. PAUL'S CHURCH-YARD;
By Law and Gilbert, St. John's Square, London.

18 1947

416-417

Deacidified using the Bookkeeper process.
Neutralizing agent: Magnesium Oxide
Treatment Date: June 2005

PreservationTechnologies
A WORLD LEADER IN PAPER PRESERVATION
111 Thomson Park Drive
Cranberry Township, PA 16066
(724) 779-2111

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
0 014 380 949 3